DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 992 UD 010 494

AUTHOR	Appel, Yetta; Berken, Ruth R.
TITLE	[Educational Facilities for Pregnant School-Age Girls in Districts 3, 4, 12, 13, and 18. Project No. 1369. Evaluation of ESEA Title I Projects in New York City 1968-69.]
INSTITUTION	Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y. Educational Research Committee.
SPONS AGENCY	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Oct 69
NOTE	101p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.15
DESCRIPTORS	*Adolescents, Child Care, Day Care Services, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Educational Programs, Health Education, Hygiene, Information Dissemination, Interviews, *Pregnancy, Questionnaires, Social Problems, Student Characteristics, Student Motivation, Student Reaction, Teaching Methods, *Unwed Mothers
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Title I Program, ESEA Title I Programs, New York City

ABSTRACT

This project for pregnant school age girls is an ESEA Title I program operating in five facilities in Manhattan, Bronx, and Brooklyn. The primary objective of the project was to assist pregnant school age girls complete their education by being able to attend school. Additional objectives included provision of information and training in personal hygiene and child care and in vocational and academic skills -- so that sustenance of the girls' motivation and ability to continue an interrupted (by pregnancy) education might be achieved. Evaluation design included systematic observation of instructional approaches and methods, interviews with project staff, questionnaires to the professional teaching staff, and group interviews with students. Areas surveyed were: implementation of the project, characteristics of the students and their responses to the program, and the instructional program. Recommendations include: recycling of the project for the 1969-70 school year, making of firm arrangements for comprehensive social welfare and medical services, provision of infant day-care centers, relocation of the Bronx district facility, and exploration of additional means of disseminating information about the project. Data tables and instrument formats are appended. (RJ)

E009e

ED041992

Project No. 1369

EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES FOR PREGNANT SCHOOL-AGE GIRLS

by Yetta Appel

October 1969

Evaluation of
ESEA Title I Projects
in New York City
1968-69

UD010494

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Center for Urban Education
105 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10016

ED041992

Center for Urban Education
Educational Research Committee
ESEA Title I Program Evaluation

EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES FOR PREGNANT SCHOOL-AGE GIRLS IN DISTRICTS 3, 4, 12, 13, and 18

Yetta Appel

with

Ruth R. Berken

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1968-69 school year.

UD010494

December 1969

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The contribution to this evaluation study of Dr. Ruth R. Berken is gratefully acknowledged. She was instrumental in facilitating liaison with both the staffs of the respective facilities and central headquarters, in evaluating the instructional program offered by the facilities, and prepared the chapter on this phase of the program. Above all, she generously shared her extensive knowledge regarding the process of education.

Yetta H. Appel
Evaluation Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Acknowledgment i

Chapter

I Description of Project and Its Evaluation 1

A. Project Description 1
B. Plan of Evaluation. 2

II Evaluation Design and Data Collection 3

A. The Evaluation Design 3
B. Instruments Utilized 3
C. Evaluation Staff 5
D. Data Collection 5
E. Limitations of the Study 8

III Implementation of the Project 9

A. Physical Setting and Operation. . . . 9
B. Coordination of Educational Program with Medical/Social Services . . . 11
C. Staffing of the Facilities. 12
D. Instructional Program and Related Activities. 14
E. Population Served 15
F. Admission Criteria, Intake and Discharge Practices 17

IV Characteristics of Population Served and Response to Program. 19

A. Referral to Program 19
B. Characteristics of the Student Population. 23
C. Student Response to the Program . . . 30

V The Instructional Program 41

A. Approaches in Evaluation 41
B. Development of the Curriculum 41
C. Recommendations For Instructional Program . 44

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd)

Chapter		Page
VI	Conclusions and General Recommendations	48
A. Conclusions.	48
B. General Recommendations.	49
Addendum	Report on Summer Program of the Facilities in Districts 3, 4, 13, and 18	51
A. Introduction	51
B. Physical Arrangements, Operation of Summer Program	52
C. Population Served by Summer Program.	55
D. Summary and Recommendations.	57

Appendix A: Tables

Appendix B: Instruments

Appendix C: Staff List

CHAPTER I

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT AND ITS EVALUATION

A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Educational Facilities for Pregnant School Age Girls is an extension of a 1967-68 Title I project which initiated a continuing educational program for pregnant school girls with the establishment of the first facility in District 12, Bronx. The current project encompasses four new educational facilities essentially patterned after the initial District 12 facility which continues to function in its original location.

As indicated in the Board of Education Project Summary, this project was to be funded under Title I from September 1968 through August 1969. It was still concerned with providing continuing educational instruction to teenage girls who become pregnant while attending school, as the board's policy up to September 1968 was to suspend students from regular school programs as soon as the pregnancy was medically certified. (A new directive from the Superintendent of Schools, Special Circular No. 10 concerning the Education of Pregnant Students, was issued September 27, 1968 and stated that pregnant girls ". . .should be permitted to remain in their regular school program as long as their physical and emotional condition permits." If a pregnant girl was no longer able to attend regular school, a transfer to one of the project's facilities was to be arranged.)

Two of the four new facilities are in Manhattan, in Districts 3 and 4, and two in Brooklyn, in Districts 13 and 18. Each facility is expected to serve 100 girls during the school year. Pregnant girls up to the age of 18, and/or about to graduate from high school are recommended for admission by guidance counselors, school administrative personnel, or community medical, health, and social welfare agencies. Pregnant teenage girls from nonpublic schools are also eligible for service. Each facility's program was to be conducted with cooperative agencies in the community who agreed to provide adjunctive medical, psychological, social work, and child care services. Overall citywide coordination of this program is vested in a headquarters staff assistant superintendent, but each of the facilities is under the direct supervision of its District Superintendent.

The primary objective of the project still is to assist pregnant school age girls to complete their education by being able to attend school. Additional objectives include providing information and training in personal hygiene and child care, and training in vocational and academic skills to enhance the girls' employability and keep open their future educational possibilities. Essentially, the project attempts, through the provision of a continuing educational program, to sustain the teenage pregnant girl's motivation and ability to continue her education after it has been interrupted by her pregnancy and assumption of the status of motherhood.

The instructional program was to be geared to the individual needs and achievement levels of the students, enabling them to meet the requirements for a high school diploma. To staff the program, there were to be three teachers for the core subjects of English, mathematics, natural sciences, and the social sciences, plus one teacher for the business education sequence, and one for home economics. Each facility was also assigned a project administrator, a guidance counselor, a school secretary, and five paraprofessionals who were to function as educational assistants, school aides, and/or family assistants.

For both the business education and home economics sequences, appropriate business machines (typewriters, adding and transcription machines, keypunch, Xerox, etc.) and homemaking equipment (kitchen units, sewing machines, infant care accessories, etc.) were to be provided and installed. Other Title I funds were to be used for supplies, textbooks, and other educational materials, and for transportation.

B. PLAN OF EVALUATION

The District 12 facility, which is included in this project, was evaluated in 1968,[1] and a major recommendation was that its relocation be expedited. This was not implemented in the course of this project, and its functioning continued essentially unchanged. It did not seem indicated therefore to include the District 12 facility in the current evaluation, which has focused on the four new facilities established.

However, the class instruction provided at the District 12 facility was included in the systematic observation of the instructional program of this project by the educational consultant, as this was not undertaken in the previous evaluation.

The summer programs of the four new facilities are also included in the evaluation, and the relevant data obtained are separately reported. This is in the addendum which follows the primary findings and conclusions regarding the facilities' regular school year program.

---

[1] Yetta H. Appel and Deborah Shapiro, An Educational Facility for Pregnant School-Age Girls - District 12X (New York: Center for Urban Education, 1968).

CHAPTER II

EVALUATION DESIGN AND DATA COLLECTION

A. THE EVALUATION DESIGN

To assess the current project's effectiveness, the evaluation design focused on the operation and instructional programs of the new facilities, the degree of educational progress and attitudinal change in the girls during attendance, and the rate of return to, and continuance in, regular school programs upon discharge from the facilities.

1. Evaluation of Operation and Instructional Programs

The following assessment procedures were utilized in evaluating the functioning of the educational program of the new facilities: systematic observation of their instructional approach and methods, and day-to-day operations; interviews with project administrative and auxiliary staff, as well as personnel from the Bureau for the Education of the Physically Handicapped (BEPH) as their non-resident home instruction program appeared to serve a similar population; a questionnaire directed to the professional teaching staff; group interviews with the students currently in attendance at the facilities, as well as a questionnaire administered in conjunction with the interviews; and a general evaluation meeting involving the instructional and administrative staff of all five facilities, the coordinator of the program from the headquarters staff assistant superintendent's office, and a representative from BEPH to review their experience in providing a continuing educational program for pregnant school age girls, and to recommend ways of improving the program.

2. Evaluation of Impact on Target Population

Assessing the impact of the program on the target population involved the following methods: collection of school and case record data on both current and discharged students; group interviews with the students currently in attendance; and a follow-up study of those discharged students transferred back to regular school programs. Follow-up interviews with students who dropped out of the program were considered, but could not be undertaken because of the limited time allotted for the evaluation.

B. INSTRUMENTS UTILIZED

Wherever possible, the interview schedules and record forms developed for the previous evaluation of the District 12 facility were adapted, or used as is, in this evaluation. Utilization of these instruments which had been subjected to pretesting facilitated the current evaluation, as its limited time period would have precluded the pretesting of new instruments. The time limitation also precluded more rigorous testing of the available instruments with regard to their reliability and validity.

A brief description of the instruments utilized follows. (Copies of the instruments will be found in Appendix B.)

The schedule developed for interviewing the project administrators (which was also utilized with slight modifications for interviewing guidance counselors, social work and nursing staff, etc.) and the questionnaire distributed to the teaching staff focused on many of the same areas explored with staff in the previous evaluation: basis for joining the facility as a staff member, responsibilities assumed, perception of the students attending the facility, evaluation of the program's value and limitations, evaluation of the course of instruction, and recommendations for program improvement.

Personal data on the students served by the four facilities were recorded on Record Form A, which is an expanded version of the form previously used. The following information was to be obtained: prior school performance, manner of referral to the facility, contact with the student's family, grade level, attendance at the facility, reading level at admission and discharge, courses taken, and disposition by end of school year.

Record Form B, also previously used, was utilized without revision to obtain the follow-up data on those discharged students transferred back to regular school programs. It calls for an evaluation of the student's school performance and social adjustment, actual attendance, and the likelihood of graduation.

The interview guide developed for the group interviews is largely based on the previous schedule used for individual interviews with a sample of girls from the District 12 facility. The areas covered in the group interview are: their perception of their prior school experience, school reaction to their pregnancy, their reaction to the option of remaining in regular schools while pregnant, evaluation of their experience at the facility including the course of instruction, and suggestions for improving the program. At the end of the group interview, the students were again asked what they thought was the most important thing the research team should tell the Board of Education about girls who get pregnant while they are in school.

Utilization of a group interview procedure recommended itself both in terms of coverage and economy, but there was concern as to whether quantifiable data would emerge from this procedure, as well as whether the data might be contaminated. To counter this, a short questionnaire was developed to be completed by each participant in the group interview at its termination. The questionnaire asked for the dates of leaving regular school and commencing attendance at the facility, their reaction to remaining in regular school while pregnant, their perception of the board's policy toward pregnant girls, manner of referral to the facility, most and least helpful courses taken, courses wanted but unavailable, and their personal goals following birth of the baby.

C. EVALUATION STAFF

In addition to the evaluation director, the staff consisted of an educational consultant, research consultant, and two interviewers. The latter collected the record data in addition to conducting the group interviews.

One of the interviewers (male, graduate student in social work, and Spanish-speaking) and the research consultant had participated in the previous evaluation of the District 12 facility. The new interviewer (female, also a graduate student in social work) had considerable prior experience in working with disadvantaged adolescents in group settings.

D. DATA COLLECTION

Although the design called for the assessment of all four new facilities, this could not be implemented. At the time this evaluation was initiated, the District 18 facility had just occupied its partially completed new quarters, and was experiencing extensive delays in receiving some of the basic equipment needed for the implementation of the instructional program. (This is more fully considered in later sections of this report.)

In view of the difficulty the facility was experiencing in becoming fully operational, proceeding with the overall evaluation as projected seemed premature, if not inappropriate, as well as unduly adding to the pressures confronting the staff. The following data therefore were not obtainable with regard to the District 18 facility: systematic observation of its class instruction, completed questionnaires from the teaching staff, group interview and questionnaire data from the girls currently in attendance, follow-up reports from the schools to which their students did return, and record data on their discharged students. Nevertheless, the facility's staff did endeavor to approximate the instructional program that was projected. The decision to delimit the evaluation of the District 18 facility was communicated to the headquarters staff assistant superintendent responsible for the citywide coordination of this project.

1. Individual Interviews

The evaluation director interviewed the project administrators of the facilities in Districts 3, 4, 13, and 18, three guidance counselors (in Districts 3, 4, and 13), four social workers (Districts 3, 4, 13, and 18), one nurse-educator in District 3, and the supervisor of the BEPH home instruction program for a total of 13 interviews. There was also considerable informal contact by the evaluation director and educational consultant with the project administrators of the four new facilities, as well as that of District 12.

2. Observational Data

In the District 3, 4, 12, and 13 facilities, the educational consultant reviewed with the project administrators and teaching staffs their respective instructional programs, and observed the class instruction offered in these facilities.

3. Teaching Staff Questionnaire

Twenty-two questionnaires were distributed to the staffs of the four new facilities, and 18 were returned. Of the 18, 15 were complete.

4. Evaluation Meeting

From the general evaluation meeting conducted by the evaluation director and educational consultant at the Center for Urban Education, common problems were identified and suggestions for improving the program were developed. Since all of the teaching personnel of the five facilities participated in this meeting, the data secured through the staff questionnaire could be further substantiated.

5. Record Data

Case and school record data, although not as complete as required, were obtained on 444 girls. For an additional 74 discharged girls, only identifying information and the basis for their discharge from the facility were available. This total of 518 girls includes those students on register in the four new facilities during the second half of the school year ending in June, and those students previously discharged from the respective facilities.

The considerable variation found in the record-keeping procedures of these four facilities, together with the unavailability of school records for those students discharged prior to April 1969, basically limited the completeness and comparability of the recorded data obtained and, consequently, the size of the group that could be included in the statistical analysis. In addition, 82 girls were found to have attended not at all, or less than 10 days, following registration. Excluding this group and those students with incomplete record data meant that a total of 363 girls constituted the data group which was analyzed as part of the current program's evaluation.

Although the girls' reading levels were to be tested at admission and discharge, this was not done consistently. Apparently, the girls' limited and varying length of attendance was primarily responsible for this. But reading levels were obtained for most of the girls who did attend, as they were usually tested following admission, and are reported. Since data concerning changes in reading performance, which may have been related to attendance at the facility, were not available, this was eliminated from the assessment procedures.

6. Student Group Interviews and Questionnaire Data

The group interviews were planned for approximately five to seven girls each in order to secure maximum responsiveness, and were conducted in mid-June at the facilities in Districts 3, 4, and 13. By this time, both interviewers had had time to familiarize themselves with the settings and to become known to the students. Both had training sessions with the evaluation director to review the content of the guide, the possible means by which the responses of each girl in the group could be elicited and contamination of responses reduced, and administration of the interview standardized. The guide permitted responses given in the course of the interview to be noted so as to reduce errors in recall. Each of the group interview reports was checked for errors and discrepancies by the evaluation director before the data were coded.

A total of 12 group meetings were held in which 60 girls participated, with the average number of girls per meeting being five. All of the girls present on the days that interviews could be scheduled were asked to participate, but not at the expense of class attendance. Because of this, only about half of the girls who attended fairly regularly were available for interviews. Although none of the girls refused to participate in the group interviews, there may have been an element of self-selection in that they were asked to indicate their availability to be interviewed.

In addition, a total of 80 girls completed the questionnaires distributed by the interviewers. Sixty of these 80 girls did so at the termination of the group interview; the 20 additional respondents were girls who were ready to complete the questionnaire although they could not be present at the times the interviews were scheduled.

7. Follow-up Study

Those discharged students who had been transferred back to regular school programs by March 1969 constituted the population of the follow-up study. This cut-off date was used to allow at least a three-month interval between the student's return to a regular school program and the follow-up assessment. For the three facilities (in Districts 3, 4, and 13) 115 girls met this criterion, and reports on them were requested from their schools. A total of 82 reports were received for a response rate of 71 percent.

E. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

As noted, the limited time allotted for the evaluation precluded the additional testing of instruments, particularly of the group interview guide and related questionnaire, as well as further checking of the findings. At the same time, data obtained from the group interviews have been compared, wherever possible, with the questionnaire responses, and little discrepancy has been found.

In addition, random selection of the students to be interviewed was considered but did not prove feasible, because of conflicts between class programs and the scheduling of the group interviews. Since self-selection may have been operative, the extent to which the group interviewed is representative of the group as a whole can be questioned. But the half of the student population interviewed in three of the facilities did not differ essentially from those not interviewed, when their background data were compared.

CHAPTER III

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT

A. PHYSICAL SETTING AND OPERATION

1. Settings, Equipment, and Operation

All of the four new facilities were initiated, as projected, in July 1968, but under considerable physical limitations in Districts 3, 13, and 18. District 3's facility began in a parish house, District 13's in space made available by a neighboring housing development and elementary school, and District 18's in a local junior high school. Districts 3 and 13 occupied their present quarters in September, but District 18 remained at the junior high school until February 1969, and consequently had to schedule their program after regular school hours, from 3:00 P.M. to 9:20 P.M.

The District 3 facility occupied two floors of an unused school building located on the lower east side of Manhattan, while District 4's facility occupied the fourth floor of an old school structure on Manhattan's upper east side, housing school child guidance personnel primarily. District 13's facility occupied renovated quarters on the ground floor of one of the buildings in the Fort Greene Housing Development. In February, District 18's facility moved into quarters still in the process of renovation, adjoining the grounds of a home for the aged in Brownsville.

In general, the facilities in Districts 3, 4, and 13 occupied quarters physically adequate for the operation of the educational program and had received almost all of the basic equipment needed for both the home economics and business education courses. But in each of these three facilities, there were notable physical deficiencies. Foremost was the lack of library space and relevant library materials in Districts 4 and 13, but even where there was space, as in District 3, provision of a library setting and materials had not been possible because of its exclusion in the original plan.

Further, in the District 3 facility, which seemed almost lost in a superabundance of space (the building had not yet undergone the renovation projected for it), no consideration was apparently given to the need for the participating students, who were in various stages of pregnancy, to have a lounge area where they could study and/or relax between classes. Until it can be renovated, the provision of such a lounge might help to give this facility a more inviting, less institutional atmosphere. A number of the girls interviewed have felt it had almost a "prison" quality.

The District 4 facility, on the other hand, was cramped for space in a building without an elevator, requiring a climb of four flights for the girls. There was very little space for quiet study, or for individual tutoring of the girls. Adequate offices for the administrative staff were lacking. It is recognized that these are only temporary quarters, for the facility is slated to occupy another school building in the district upon its renovation. However, the facility will still be in operation here for the coming school year, if not longer, and the possibility of obtaining additional space in its present quarters should be considered.

Although District 13's facility had more physically appropriate quarters, it also lacked, in addition to the library, really adequate space for sewing instruction and for the food preparation component of the home economics sequence. It was also devoid of areas where the students and the teaching staff could study, prepare lessons, and/or relax. This facility, it should be noted, has no allotted lunchroom area; the students went to a nearby elementary school for their lunch. In addition, it was situated on the ground floor. This posed a particular hazard in the summertime, since, for purposes of ventilation, its front door was kept open (contrary to Board of Education regulations) making it vulnerable to unwarranted intrusions.

Since the renovation of District 18's quarters was not completed before occupancy, this facility operated without much of its basic equipment, thereby affecting implementation of the instructional program. A lack of appropriate electrical outlets forced the staff and students to use manual business machines until the end of May. Needed equipment for the home economics sequence, for example, sewing machines, kitchen appliances and accessories, etc., started to arrive as late as mid-May. Blackboards and related educational materials were also slow in arriving. In addition, no budgetary provision was made for a cot and mattress, although pregnant girls were in daily attendance. This equipment was ultimately obtained through the administrator's efforts.

Considerable and continuing delay in receiving allocated equipment and supplies was reported by all four administrators. In order to enable the facilities to become operational, and to initiate the instructional program, these administrators had to make frequent contact with as many as 20 different bureaus and/or divisions of the Board of Education. To procure textbooks, for example, they found they had to depend on local junior and senior high schools if they were to have textbooks at all.

In addition, administrators have questioned the method of delivery of small items, such as an electric can opener, by truck, which involved handling charges equivalent to more than half of the cost of the item, presumably paid for by Title I funds. Handling charges over and above the listed amount were requested for routine deliveries to the District 4 facility because of the number of flights involved.

In March, a headquarters staff person was assigned the responsibility of expediting equipment and supply requests from these facilities; this eased the situation somewhat. But the administrators still appeared to spend a disproportionate amount of time on the procedural aspects involved in securing the requisite equipment, transportation passes, supplies, etc. from the various agencies of the Board of Education.

2. Provision of School Lunches

The inadequacy of the lunches provided, particularly in view of the special nutritional needs of pregnant teenage girls, was documented in the previous evaluation of the District 12 facility. This continued to be a problem in the operation of three of the four new facilities, (Districts 3, 4, and 18). District 13 had apparently remedied the situation through an arrangement with a local elementary school which prepared appropriate hot lunches on its premises. The girls were served lunch separately from the regular pupils.

The inadequacy of the lunches was found to be due to their being provided by the elementary division of the Bureau of School Lunches rather than its high school division, as well as the lack of provision of the necessary equipment for serving hot lunches at the facilities.

In general, the problems reported above can be attributed to an apparent lack of prior planning by central headquarters staff regarding the incorporation of this new program within the existing structure of the educational system. Contributing also to these problems is that the program has, in its relatively short existence experienced three changes in assistant superintendents responsible for its overall coordination, and that responsibility for this coordination was vested in superintendents assigned to the Junior High School division. In addition, the individuals assigned as administrators were given insufficient lead time in which to establish their facilities as fully operational units.

B. COORDINATION OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM WITH MEDICAL/SOCIAL SERVICES

The educational program was closely coordinated with essential medical, counseling, and social services in Districts 13 and 18 by the allocation of the required staff and resources by the cooperating community agencies. In District 4, medical and health services were provided, but not the supportive social services which are equally needed. In District 3, none of the requisite services were made available by the community agency (due to a cutback in funds), although it had entered into an agreement to do so with the Board of Education.

District 13's cooperative arrangements appear to be the most comprehensive. Project Teen Aid, the agency primarily responsible for the provision of the needed supportive services, had both social work and nursing staff on the facility's premises, and attempted to provide follow-up care to those girls who discontinued attendance and/or were discharged from the program. The girls were not only followed by the social work staff but also by the nurse who checked them weekly during their attendance at the facility and as needed afterwards. Individual and group counseling were offered, and home visits were made by case aides when indicated.

Close coordination and planning for each girl's maximal participation and development was facilitated by this proximity of Teen Aid staff and school personnel, as well as the necessary medical coverage. In addition, a gynecologist from the affiliated hospital, Cumberland, gave the course on the physiological and psychological impact of pregnancy and childbirth, conception, and family planning.

In District 18, the Brookdale Community Mental Health Center also provided a psychiatric social worker and three social work assistants on the facility's premises, but no nursing personnel from the hospital were available. Individual and group counseling services, and extensive home visits by the social work assistants were provided. A psychiatrist, also from the Center, treated a selected group of 5 to 8 girls through group psychotherapy, and provided consultation to the facility's staff. The course on pregnancy was taught by a physician and nurse-midwife from the Brookdale Center.

In this facility, close liaison with the Brownsville Community Council resulted in an enrichment of the school's program through outings of a cultural and/or recreational nature arranged by the Council. In addition, it was instrumental in obtaining Neighborhood Youth Corps stipends for a majority of the girls registered at the facility, almost all of whom had very limited financial resources.

The medical and health services made available by Roosevelt Hospital to District 4's facility included the provision of nursing personnel on the facility's premises to handle possible medical emergencies, as well as for the classes on the impact of pregnancy, infant and child care, and for individual consultation, e.g., as regards family planning.

Because ready access to social work services was a critical factor in this type of program, the administrators of the District 3 and 4 facilities requested assistance from the Bureau of Child Guidance. A full-time social worker was assigned to District 3's facility at the beginning of March, and to District 4 at the beginning of May 1969. However, the District 3 facility is still without access to necessary local community medical and health services, and has no medical coverage at all. This has also meant that medical personnel were not available to teach the course on the impact of pregnancy. However, a nurse-educator was secured from the Maternity Center Association for this on the initiative of the facility's administrator.

It should be noted that, with the assignment of child guidance staff to Districts 3 and 4, there was more follow-up regarding clinic attendance, coordination of school programs with personal and health needs, and somewhat more contact with the families of the girls to support their current attendance and return to regular school programs.

C. STAFFING OF THE FACILITIES

With regard to the professional and administrative staffing of the facilities, all of them were able to secure teaching staff for the core subject areas, as well as the allocated guidance and secretarial personnel. Two of the facilities (in Districts 13 and 18) had five teachers each, and two (in Districts 3 and 4) had six teachers. The latter two obtained the services of a sixth teacher through the use of their respective districts' decentralized funds.

Of the total of 22 teachers (six of whom were male), information on educational background and prior experience was available for 18. Seventeen of the 18 teachers had additional graduate education beyond the baccalaureate, or a Master's degree. Half of the 18 teachers had regular Board of Education licenses, and half substitute licenses. It should be noted that the remaining four teachers were also licensed by the Board, but whether they held regular or substitute licenses is not known.

The 18 teachers had considerable prior teaching experience; the average number of years in teaching was ten, with a range from three to more than 16 years. Sixteen of the 18 teachers previously taught at the high school grade level. Finally, ten had prior experience with special school programs, e.g., for slow learners, "adjustment" classes, career guidance programs, or had taught in the Peace Corps. However, none of them had had previous experience in teaching and/or working with pregnant school-age girls.

All four facilities had English and mathematics teachers, but only three had specific social studies teachers. The teacher of English in the District 18 facility also taught social studies. All four facilities had teachers for the home economics sequence, and all but that in District 13 had teachers for the business education sequence. Recruitment of a teacher for this specialized sequence in the District 13 facility was hampered in part by the sudden death of its first administrator. Consequently, the mathematics teacher attempted to teach part of the course's content on a minimal, stop-gap basis. In this facility, too, the guidance counselor provided classes in clothing construction for those students taking vocational course programs.

Except for District 3's facility, all also had teachers of general science and/or biology. District 3's facility was the only one to have an art teacher.

All of the facilities obtained paraprofessional assistance, although this tended to be more in the form of school aides and/or family assistants than educational assistants. Various forms of assistance to the administrative and teaching staff appeared to be the primary function of the school aides and/or family assistants. They acted as receptionists, supervised the serving of lunch, provided considerable clerical assistance, escorted girls when indicated, etc. The District 13 facility, for example, employed one of its graduates as a school aide.

The educational assistants, on the other hand, were all college students and were primarily involved in the individual tutoring of students under the direction of the professional staff. A total of seven educational assistants were engaged by the District 3 and 4 facilities only.

It should be noted that none of these four new facilities had a school nurse assigned to them, as was (and continues to be) available part time at the District 12 facility. This was not critical for the District 4 and 13 facilities, but was for Districts 3 and 18. Assignment of such nurses by the respective school districts of the Department of Health to both facilities, but in particular to District 3, should be sought to provide some of the presently unavailable medical coverage.

D. INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

1. Nature of Instructional Program

The organization and implementation of the core instructional program is separately considered in Chapter V. But it should be noted here that a course on the impact of pregnancy and the related areas of conception, family planning, infant and child care, etc., which had been suggested in the previous evaluation, was provided in all four facilities. As was previously found, nursing personnel reported basic misconceptions and evident lack of knowledge concerning pregnancy and childbirth on the part of these pregnant students.

As will be evident, the educational requirements and levels of the students encompassed the entire high school curriculum, but the limited number of teachers allocated per facility prevented the provision of the range of courses needed by the students served. The students particularly affected were those enrolled in either academic or vocational programs.

In addition, the target population as a whole tended not to be exposed to basic business skills training as occurred in the District 12 facility. Such training appears to be a particularly appropriate educational objective for this group of students, most of whom will need to support themselves and a child. Moreover, it is an objective of which they largely approve. (For example, three students were engaged as part-time typists for this evaluation study because of the proficiency they had developed through the typing course provided at their respective facilities.) This training was least possible in Districts 13 and 18; in the former because of the lack of staff and in the latter because of serious equipment problems.

Full implementation was not achieved in the other two districts, in part because of equipment shortages, as well as the range of course demands on the teacher involved, e.g., typing, bookkeeping, clerical practices, shorthand, distributive education, which could not always be programmed even for those students preparing themselves for a commercial diploma.

2. Extracurricular Activities

Closely related to the instructional program were various extracurricular activities which, on the one hand, attempted to strengthen the girls' self-esteem and motivation to continue their education, and, on the other, to involve their families and publicize the program in the respective communities. In general, little involvement of the girls' parents was evident. "Open Houses" were held at two facilities for parents, students (both former and current), and community visitors. A "Baby Day" program was planned at two other facilities at the end of the school year which enabled the staff and others to visit with the young mothers who brought in their babies.

Further, graduation exercises were held for those students graduating from high school, as well as those completing junior high school. This was particularly meaningful for the girls who would have been eligible to participate in the graduation ceremonies of their former schools, but were prevented from doing so by their pregnancies.

E. POPULATION SERVED.

In contrast to the District 12 facility, these four facilities enrolled girls from a wider geographical area than their respective school districts. This had been necessitated, in part, by the critical space limitations of the Bronx facility, and the absence of any facilities in Queens and Richmond. The two Manhattan-based facilities admitted girls from the Bronx, as well as some from Queens who were ready to travel to them. Both Brooklyn-based facilities registered girls from other parts of the borough who would otherwise have had their schooling interrupted.

Table I gives the total population registered at the four facilities from their inception through May 1969. A total of 229 students were on register as of that month at the four facilities; 207 students who had attended for 10 days or more had been discharged, as well as 82 students who had not attended following registration, or who had attended for less than 10 days, for a grand total of 518. As previously noted, 363 students of this total on whom sufficient data were available for analysis constitute the evaluation group.

TABLE III-1

POPULATION AT FOUR FACILITIES FROM INCEPTION THROUGH MAY 1969*

(N = 518)

Status of Population	Facility In Dist. 3	Dist. 4	Dist. 13	Dist. 18	Total
On register as of May 1969	44	71	67	47	229
Discharged as of May 1969 - attended 10 days or more	20	67	78	42	207
Discharged - registered but attended less than 10 days	14	21	22	25	82
Total	78	159	167	114	518

*Includes students registered for the 1968 summer session.

As is apparent, the four facilities as a whole enrolled considerably more than the total projected for them for the 1968-69 school year (100 students per facility for a total of 400), but this was primarily due to over-enrollment in Districts 4 and 13. The District 3 facility tended to be under-utilized, and the possible contributing factors will be considered below.

That this program appears to be reaching to a considerable extent the target population for whom it was intended is revealed in the year-end statistics of BEPH. They found that they served about 190 fewer students in the 1968-69 school year through their non-resident home instruction program when compared to the previous year. This seems largely attributable to the development of these new facilities, and occurred with relatively little publicity about the existence of the program. At the same time, it should be recognized that this program, even with its current expansion, is providing service at a rate far below the known prevalence of pregnancy among schoolage girls in the community. According to the Public Education Association, there were 6000 girls aged 17 and under who gave birth in New York City in 1967.

F. ADMISSION CRITERIA, INTAKE AND DISCHARGE PRACTICES

1. Admission Criteria

As with the District 12 facility, there were no limitations in the general guidelines regarding the admission of students to these four new facilities. Consequently, the facilities accepted, on the whole, any pregnant student referred who could benefit from the program as long as the girl was able to accommodate herself to the facility's procedures and program. At the same time, there was concern that the facilities should not become a "dumping ground" for seriously emotionally disturbed students and/or chronic truants, who also were pregnant and could therefore be discharged by their regular schools to these new settings.

But each of the four facilities extended itself to serve some of these more problematic students, if they appeared motivated to continue their education, and found that a number of them were able to participate and benefit from the program if they and/or their families received consistent supportive help from social work and/or guidance staff. On the other hand, six girls had to discontinue attending the facilities because of illness associated with the pregnancy.

The flexibility of the admission criteria was further evident in the non-adherence to the upper age limit, particularly if girls were in the twelfth grade, in the admission of a handful of girls pregnant for the second time, and in the admission of five postpartum girls. The girls pregnant for the second time were admitted because of their motivation to continue their education even though their schooling had already been seriously disrupted by the first pregnancy, and one was able to graduate. The postpartum girls' admission was related, in part, to their inability to return to regular schools during the school strikes, and to serious home problems involving their newborn infants with which they needed help in order to be able to return to school, as they eventually did. By being able to attend the facility, they experienced less disruption in their schooling, and support of their efforts to return.

It should also be noted that in District 18 the student and her parent or guardian were asked for written consent regarding the girl's possibly being referred for intensive casework and/or psychiatric treatment at the Brookdale Community Mental Health Center as part of the admission process. It was felt that parents should not only know about, but agree to, their daughter's being psychiatrically evaluated. Failure to give consent did not prevent the girl's admission to the facility, but it did tend to limit the kind of treatment services which could be extended.

2. Intake Practices

In Districts 13 and 18, it was usual for the girl (and her parent if present) to be seen first by the social worker and then by the guidance counselor. Essentially, the psychiatric social worker in District 18 did all of the initial screening; this tended to be shared between Project Teen Aid staff and the facility's guidance counselor in District 13.

In Districts 3 and 4, the guidance counselors found that they had to do almost all of the initial screening, i.e., consider some of the personal and familial problems ordinarily within the social worker's province, because of the absence of social work services until the assignment of requisite staff from the Bureau of Child Guidance.

The guidance counselors were primarily responsible for planning the girls' course programs and grade placements, as well as providing needed educational and vocational counseling and the administration of reading and other achievement tests. Essentially, the student's orientation to the facility's educational program appeared to be almost entirely the guidance counselor's responsibility. Their guidance function, however, was seriously hampered at times by the slowness with which the girls' previous school records were forwarded to the facilities, which the counselors felt reflected, in part, a general lack of awareness of the program within the school system.

3. Discharge Practices

As at the District 12 facility, it was found that the students were not able to return to regular school programs immediately after delivery. Transfers back needed to be timed so as to be most supportive to the students, in the sense of enabling them to remain in regular schools once they have returned to them. Returning to school after a prolonged absence is difficult for any student, but especially so for girls responsible for the care of a baby and suffering from feelings of being "different." Additionally, stable child care plans needed to be worked out to the extent that this was possible.

Further, a girl's transfer back to a regular school program appeared to be facilitated if it was timed to coincide with the usual term changes, as in September and February. On this basis, the four facilities tended not to discharge their post-partum students to a regular school program after the end of March, resulting in a relatively larger proportion of such students being enrolled during the period of the evaluation. Of the 229 current students in the four facilities, 53 percent had already delivered and were being permitted to complete the school year at their respective facilities.

CHAPTER IV

CHARACTERISTICS OF POPULATION SERVED AND RESPONSE TO PROGRAM

A. REFERRAL TO PROGRAM

Before considering the data on the students' characteristics, the means by which they reached the program needs to be considered. Two sources of data regarding the manner of referral were available: records kept by social work and/or guidance personnel, and the girls' responses on the questionnaire (in Districts 3, 4, and 13) as to who had sent them to register at the special school. The girls were also asked to give the date they left regular school and the date they began attendance at the facility.

1. Source of Referral

Table IV-1 gives the breakdown of referral sources for the sample of 363 girls in the four facilities as gathered from the record data. For the group as a whole, almost twice as many, 37 percent to 19 percent, were referred through hospitals and/or clinics than by school personnel. In District 18 the school referrals were slightly larger, 30 percent as against 26 percent from hospital sources. Further, in District 3 there is a much larger proportion referred through social service agencies than through the schools, 27 percent as compared to 16 percent. Another significant source of referral for the group as a whole appears to be peers, as this accounted for 11 percent of the total. In District 3 this source was about as equally important as that of school personnel.

Table IV-2 presents the results from the questionnaire responses of those students (N = 78) who volunteered to complete the form and/or participate in the group interviews in Districts 3, 4, and 13. This, of course, limited the coverage and made for a somewhat biased sample. But one still finds an almost similar proportion, 35 percent, referred through hospital and/or medical sources. However, referrals through school personnel are substantially higher, 36 percent, and may reflect the increasing number of girls referred initially by the school toward the end of the school year, which was also noted by guidance counselors. (The questionnaire was distributed in these districts in the last two weeks of the regular school year.) In addition, relatively more of the girls reached these three facilities, as a whole, through peers and parents/relatives than was apparent from the record data, with the latter source being of considerable importance in District 3, and the former in District 4, according to the girls' responses.

TABLE IV-1

SOURCE OF REFERRAL
(FROM RECORD DATA)

BY PERCENT

(N = 363)

	To Facilities In				
Source of Referral	Dist. 3	Dist. 4	Dist. 13	Dist. 18	Total
Hospitals/Clinics	33.0	48.3	34.0	26.0	37.0
School personnel	16.0	14.0	22.0	30.0	19.0
Friends/Facility students	17.0	2.5	17.0	8.0	11.0
Social service agencies	27.0	-	8.0	2.0	8.0
Community persons	3.0	0.9	5.0	4.0	3.0
Parent/Relatives	3.0	2.5	4.0	-	3.0
Self-referral	-	3.0	1.0	-	2.0
Information unavailable	1.0	28.8	9.0	30.0	17.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N = 64)	(N = 118)	(N = 134)	(N = 47)	(N = 363)

Note: **The N's which determined the various percents within this and the following tables were not included deliberately because this is no longer a general practice, and, moreover, would have made these particular tables quite difficult to lay out and read. -- Y.H.A.**

TABLE IV-2

SOURCE OF REFERRAL
(FROM STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE)

BY PERCENT

(N = 78)

Source of Referral	From Girls In Dist. 3	 Dist. 4	 Dist. 13	Total
Hospital personnel	42.0	24.0	45.0	35.0
School personnel	29.0	38.0	40.0	36.0
Friends/Facility students	4.0	29.0	5.0	15.0
Parents/Relatives	21.0	-	5.0	8.0
Social service personnel	4.0	9.0	5.0	6.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N = 24)	(N =34)	(N = 20)	(N = 78)

These findings underscore the importance of this continuing educational program being closely associated with public health and/or hospital services, i.e., the need to provide a truly comprehensive program of services, in terms of reaching the target population. This reflects the fact that the girls in general would tend to seek out a medical source for verification of pregnancy, and in the areas from which these facilities draw their population it is most likely to be a hospital clinic. At the same time, the girls try to hide their pregnant status from school personnel in view of their dominant feeling that its discovery will result in their immediate suspension, if not expulsion from school. In the group interviews, 27 out of 59 girls thought that one or the other would occur, whereas only two knew about the "special schools," and an additional six girls were aware of the new ruling that allows them to remain in regular school if this is at all a feasible arrangement.

The girls emphasized further that the existence of this program was not "publicized" enough within the school system, and so tended to reinforce their not revealing their pregnancy to school personnel until it was beyond their control, i.e., "when it began to show." Parenthetically, this appears to account as well for the majority of them not entering the program until the fifth month of pregnancy as is reported below. It seems, therefore, that the coordination of this program with maternal health and/or hospital services enabled girls who might otherwise have tended to drop out of school in order to avoid revealing their pregnant status, particularly if they were over 17 years of age, to still reach this educational program.

The lack of implementation of the cooperative agreement with local community medical facilities in District 3 would appear to account to a considerable extent for the under-utilization of this facility, given the limited role of the schools as a referral source in this and two of the other three districts. For even in the absence of such an agreement, a third of this facility's referrals came through hospitals.

2. Time Interval re: Attending Facility

This information was again only available for the facilities in Districts 3, 4, and 13. From the relevant dates supplied by the girls, it appears that almost half were able to start attending the facilities within the same month of leaving regular school, with about a fourth doing so within one week.(See Table IV-3) Thus, for this group, there appeared to be relatively little interruption of their schooling. An additional 28 percent began to attend one month later.

TABLE IV-3

TIME INTERVAL BEFORE ENTERING FACILITY FOR DISTRICTS 3, 4, 13 (FROM STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE)

BY PERCENT

(N = 78)

Time Interval	Dist. 3	Dist. 4	Dist. 13	Total
Within one week	25.0	23.0	20.0	23.0
Within same month	29.0	27.0	20.0	26.0
One month later	25.0	32.0	25.0	28.0
Two months later	4.0	-	25.0	8.0
Three months later	4.0	12.0	-	6.0
Not answered	13.0	6.0	10.0	9.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N = 24)	(N =34)	(N = 20)	(N = 78)

In general, the facilities tried to admit girls as soon as possible following referral, unless their maximum physical capacity was already enrolled, as did occur in Districts 4 and 13. From the data, it is not known whether this was responsible for the 25 percent in District 13 who began to attend two months later, and the 12 percent in District 4 three months later, or that it reflects, instead, the time needed by the girls involved to learn about the program's existence, particularly since they had already stopped attending regular school.

B. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STUDENT POPULATION

1. Age at Admission

The median age at admission for the 363 girls from the four facilities was 16 years, which was also the median age for the population previously evaluated at the District 12 facility (see Table IV-4). Seventy-two percent of the group of 363 girls were between 15 and 17 years of age, with the next largest group, 17 percent, being 18 years and over. Slightly more than 10 percent were 14 years and under.

TABLE IV-4

AGE AT ADMISSION TO THE FOUR FACILITIES

BY PERCENT

(N = 363)

Age at Admission	To Facilities In Dist. 3	Dist. 4	Dist. 13	Dist. 18	Total
11 to 13 years	-	0.9	-	4.0	0.8
14 years	16.0	9.3	7.5	9.0	9.6
15 years	20.0	16.1	22.4	15.0	19.0
16 years	28.0	32.2	21.6	28.0	27.0
17 years	16.0	27.1	32.1	21.0	26.2
18 years and over	20.0	14.4	15.7	23.0	17.1
Information unavailable	-	-	0.7	-	0.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N = 64)	(N = 118)	(N = 134)	(N = 47)	(N = 363)

2. Grade Level at Admission

The median grade level for the 363 girls included in the evaluation was the eleventh. As is evident in Table IV-5, only 21 percent were junior high school students, with the remainder being in senior high school. Of the 76 junior high school students, 50 were in the ninth grade. The senior high school girls were almost equally distributed among the tenth, eleventh and twelfth grades. This distribution appears to be similar for all four facilities, but differs somewhat from that found in the previous evaluation of the District 12 facility, where the median grade level was the tenth grade.

TABLE IV-5

GRADE LEVEL AT ADMISSION TO THE FOUR FACILITIES

BY PERCENT

(N = 363)

	Facilities In				
Grade Level	Dist. 3	Dist. 4	Dist. 13	Dist. 18	Total
6th and 7th grades	-	3.0	0.7	6.0	2.0
8th grade	3.0	6.0	5.2	6.0	5.0
9th grade	16.0	15.0	13.0	11.0	13.8
10th grade	23.0	22.0	29.1	21.0	24.8
11th grade	31.0	26.0	30.0	24.0	28.1
12th grade	25.0	28.0	22.0	32.0	26.0
Information unavailable	2.0	-	-	-	0.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N = 64)	(N = 118)	(N = 134)	(N = 47)	(N = 363)

When one considers the grade distribution in relation to the ages of the girls registered, it is apparent that a considerable number of the girls are below their expected grade level. The grade distribution indicates further that more than half of the students enrolled in the program typically need one to two full years to graduate from high school.

3. Stage of Pregnancy at Admission

Table IV-6 reveals that only 13 percent of the group of 363 girls were admitted to the respective facilities in the first trimester of pregnancy. By far the largest number, 68 percent, were not admitted until the second trimester, with the median month of pregnancy being the fifth month. Less than 20 percent were in the third trimester as compared with 32 percent in the District 12 facility. The latter had been attributed in part to District 12's very limited space which resulted in a considerable waiting period for almost half of their population before admission.

The expansion of this continuing educational program in the 1968-69 school year with the relatively more spacious quarters of the four new facilities (when compared with those of the District 12 facility) has meant apparently that fewer girls had to wait for admission as occurred in District 12, and were therefore less advanced in their pregnancy when admitted. That there was relatively little delay between leaving regular school and admission to these new facilities has been documented above.

TABLE IV-6

STAGE OF PREGNANCY AT ADMISSION TO THE FOUR FACILITIES

BY PERCENT

(N = 363)

	Facilities In				
Stage of Pregnancy	Dist. 3	Dist. 4	Dist. 13	Dist. 18	Total
First trimester	16.0	11.0	14.0	11.0	13.0
Second trimester	59.0	74.0	70.0	62.0	68.0
Third trimester	20.0	13.0	16.0	23.0	17.0
Postpartum	3.0	2.0	-	2.0	1.4
Information unavailable	2.0	-	-	2.0	0.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N = 64)	(N = 118)	(N = 134)	(N = 47)	(N = 363)

4. **Reading Level of the Students**

Of the 363 girls who comprise the evaluation group, 297 were tested during their attendance at the facilities, usually at the point of admission. Table IV-7 presents the degree of reading achievement of this group of girls, and it is apparent that a large majority were below grade level. Only 19 percent were reading at grade or above, whereas 55 percent were functioning three or more years below grade level. For 15 percent of the girls, the reading retardation was as much as five to seven grades below.

TABLE IV-7

READING LEVEL OF STUDENTS TESTED AT THE FOUR FACILITIES BY PERCENT

(N = 297)

	Students In				
Reading Level	Dist. 3	Dist. 4	Dist. 13	Dist. 18	Total
1 to 4 grades above	12.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	8.0
At grade	14.0	11.0	8.0	22.0	11.0
1 to 2 grades below	31.0	26.0	25.0	24.0	26.0
3 to 4 grades below	23.0	34.0	52.0	32.0	40.0
5 to 6 grades below	16.0	16.0	8.0	11.0	12.0
7 grades or more below	4.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N = 49)	(N =83)	(N = 128)	(N = 37)	(N = 297)

5. Sociocultural Characteristics

As was found in the evaluation of the District 12 facility, the population served by these four new facilities also consists predominantly of black and Puerto Rican students whose families exist at or just above the poverty level, and have to cope additionally with the tensions of ghetto living. Of the four new facilities, the one in District 3 serves the most ethnically diverse population because of its location.

The social work staff of the various facilities have indicated that many of the girls served are in single-parent families supported by public assistance. They have also found long-standing family problems which the girl's pregnancy only exacerbates, particularly if the girls are under 15 years of age, with these families, understandably, tending to be less supportive of the girl's continuing in school. At the same time, these girls have the most years of schooling to complete with little in the way of family resources to sustain them.

6. Length of Attendance

For the 134 discharged girls of the total of 363 (these girls had attended 10 days or more at the facilities in Districts 3, 4, and 13), the average length of attendance tended to be from one to three months. (See Table IV-8.) Only 40 percent attended from four to six months, and four percent over six months.

TABLE IV-8

LENGTH OF ATTENDANCE OF STUDENTS DISCHARGED BY MAY 1969
IN THREE FACILITIES

BY PERCENT

(N = 134)

	Facilities In			
Length of Attendance	Dist. 3	Dist. 4	Dist. 13	Total
1 to 3 months	55.0	66.0	49.0	56.0
4 to 6 months	40.0	30.0	46.0	40.0
7 to 9 months	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N = 20)	(N = 47)	(N = 67)	(N = 134)

For the currently enrolled group of 229 girls in the four facilities, slightly more than half of the total, 51 percent, have already attended four to six months, and almost a third from one to three months. (See Table IV-9.)

TABLE IV-9

LENGTH OF ATTENDANCE OF STUDENTS ON REGISTER JUNE 1969 IN FOUR FACILITIES

BY PERCENT

(N = 229)

Length of Attendance	Facilities in Dist. 3	Dist. 4	Dist. 13	Dist. 18	Total
1 to 3 months	22.0	20.0	40.0	43.0	31.0
4 to 6 months	39.0	59.0	48.0	57.0	51.0
7 to 9 months	32.0	20.0	12.0	-	16.0
10 to 12 months	7.0	1.0	-	-	2.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N = 44)	(N = 71)	(N = 67)	(N = 47)	(N = 229)

In general, one would expect a relationship to exist between stage of pregnancy and length of attendance. But the stage of pregnancy did not altogether account for longer than average attendance, as only 13 percent of the group of 363 girls were admitted in the first trimester of pregnancy. It apparently reflects the previously noted practices of not discharging girls after mid-term as well as allowing those whose post-partum adjustment and/or plans were problematic to remain at the facilities longer. Longer length of attendance also enabled 43 of this group, or 19 percent to graduate from the four facilities in June 1969. Among discharged students, a shorter length of attendance can be attributed, in part, to the greater number of discharges which were timed to the regular term changes in September and February.

More than a third of the current students in the District 3 facility have been enrolled for seven months or more. This extended attendance, in contrast to the other three facilities, appears related in addition to the factors noted above, to this facility's lower total census and rate of referrals.

In general, most of the girls who are served by this continuing educational program are not likely to remain in the program for more than six months. In point of fact, their exposure to it is more likely to be less than more.

C. STUDENT RESPONSE TO THE PROGRAM

1. Continuation in School

The degree of achievement of the project's primary objective was measured through the limited follow-up study, the number of students graduating from the four facilities, and the disposition or plans of the total group of students registered by these facilities.

A total of 82 follow-up reports were received regarding students who had formerly attended the facilities in Districts 3, 4, and 13 and had returned to regular school: eight out of eleven for District 3; 32 out of 50 for District 4; and 42 out of 54 for District 13. Fifty-two of these 82 students, or 63 percent, were reported to have been in continuous attendance for at least three months. The remainder had either returned and dropped out, or did not follow through on their plan to return.

Of this total of 52 students who continued in school, 12 were able to graduate either in January or June of 1969. For the group as a whole, it was anticipated that 65 percent were likely to graduate in this and the next two school years, although 96 percent were taking courses leading to a diploma. Sixty-eight percent were able to maintain their grade level, and 77 percent were rated by regular school personnel as making good to excellent social and personal adjustments. Attendance by this group of students was generally good, although they were responsible for infants at home. A handful of girls were actively involved in extracurricular activities, such as student government, "Future Teachers Club," or had been cited for outstanding achievement.

The 30 girls who were no longer attending regular school had been discharged because of poor attendance primarily. Four of the 30 girls had been in the twelfth grade, ten in the eleventh, 11 in the tenth, and five in eighth or ninth grades.

In addition to the 12 reported to have graduated following their return to regular schools, another five girls were known to have graduated through information available to the staffs of the facilities. This number added to the 49 girls who graduated directly from the four facilities made for a total of 66 graduates, exclusive of the graduates from the District 12 facility. Since there were a total of 102 twelfth graders who attended for 10 days or more, it is apparent that two-thirds of them were enabled to graduate through the program's expansion and their participation in it. This result, together with the relatively small number of twelfth graders among those who dropped out after returning to regular school, appears to reinforce a conclusion of the previous evaluation, namely, that those students who are closer to graduation seem more motivated to attend.

One of these graduates, as previously noted, was hired to be a school aide by a facility, and four others have been accepted for college programs.

Table IV-10 gives the disposition status, or future plans, for the 518 students registered by the four facilities. In considering the data, one needs to keep in mind that practically all of these students kept, or planned to keep, their babies -- only one was known to have given up her child for adoption.

TABLE IV-10

DISPOSITION OR PLANS AS OF JUNE 1969
OF POPULATION REGISTERED BY THE
FOUR FACILITIES

BY PERCENT

(B = 518)

Disposition/Plans	Percent
Discharge/Returned to regular school	26.0
At facility/Plan to return to regular school	23.0
"Dropped out"/Discharged for non-attendance at facility	15.0
Not returning to school due to home, child care problems	11.0
Graduated high school from facility	10.0
At facility/Plans uncertain	10.0
Not returning to school/Employed or in training program	2.0
Other disposition	2.0
Unable to attend due to illness	1.0
Total	100.0

From the table, the objectives of the project appear to have been achieved for 61 percent of the population registered, i.e., the 26 percent who were discharged and returned to regular school, the 23 percent who plan to return to school upon discharge, the 10 percent who graduated from the facilities, and the two percent who obtained employment or enrolled in Manpower training programs. The number may well be larger as some of the girls included in the 10 percent whose plans were uncertain will probably return to regular school.

The students' responses on the questionnaire further reinforce this finding. To the question of what they would most want to do once they had their babies, 55 percent checked returning to regular school. (See Table IV-11.) An additional 13 percent wanted to continue their education, but at the facilities instead of returning to regular school. Nine percent hoped they could go on to college. On the other hand, 15 percent wanted to stay home for awhile with their babies, and then secure employment.

TABLE IV-11

STUDENTS' GOALS AS REPORTED ON QUESTIONNAIRE

BY PERCENT

(N = 78)

Goals	Percent
Return to regular school	55.0
Care for baby/Then employment	15.0
Continue school at facility	13.0
Go to college	9.0
Continue school if baby cared for	4.0
Stay home with baby	3.0
Plans uncertain	1.0
Total	100.0

For a fourth of the population registered, the program appears not to have succeeded in its primary objective. This includes the 15 percent who dropped out of the facilities or were discharged for non-attendance, and the 11 percent who appeared still interested in school but were unable to continue because of family pressures and/or inability to arrange for substitute care for their babies while they attended school. (See Table IV-10).

With regard to the 82 girls discharged for non-attendance, 50 had attended for less than ten days. The group as a whole did not differ in their age range, grade levels, or stages of pregnancy from the girls who did manage to attend. Because of their very limited attendance, little background data were available for them. However, it was the impression of the social work and/or guidance staff that their discontinuance tended to be related to serious family pathology, poor motivation interacting with age, i.e., that they tended to be younger than older, and that the facility's curriculum might not be relevant for them. One of the social workers thought that some of them might prefer a setting that was not patterned as much after regular school, and as academically oriented, because they "may have had it" with regular school. It was suggested that this group needed more in the way of reaching out and/or supportive services than the program as presently structured has been able to provide.

As for the other 11 percent, it was thought that the establishment of infant day-care facilities as an adjunct to this program might enable a considerable number in this group to continue their schooling.

In general, from a half to two-thirds of the population that was exposed to the program was helped to continue, and/or complete their education. Of the number who did return to regular school, there was further attrition to the extent that only about two-thirds were still found to be regularly attending. As was pointed out in the previous evaluation, the project's focus remained exclusively on the crisis precipitated by the pregnancy rather than attempting to extend help as well to young mothers having to cope with two often conflicting social roles of mother and student. The 13 percent who indicated a preference for remaining at the facilities may well be the group who continued to need the type of supportive help they had been receiving, and without which they would tend to drop out of regular school once they returned.

2. Attendance in the Program

In determining the average number of days absent per month per student, only non-excused absences were included. Absences due to delivery and post-partum recovery, or for clinic attendance were excluded. For the discharged group (N = 134), the average number of days absent per month was nine. For the group on register as of May (N = 229), the absence rate through June averaged six days per month per student. Thus the absence rate for the total in the evaluation group (N = 363) was 7.5 days per month per student.

There was some difference among the facilities with regard to the rate of absence. The average number of days absent per month for the District 3 facility was ten, for Districts 4 and 18 it was seven, and for District 13, six days.

Before considering the basis for the somewhat higher absence rate for the District 3 facility, it should be noted that attendance was expected to be irregular because of the physical status of the population being served. This was found in the evaluation of the District 12 facility, and has been additionally confirmed in the present evaluation. But the relatively high absence rate in general was of basic concern to the staffs of the facilities.

Some of the contributing factors were identified previously. As occurred in District 12, students were not automatically discharged if they failed to return following delivery. They were marked absent instead, while the social work and/or guidance staffs attempted to help the student return to school. This practice did, of course, affect the absence rate.

The staffs of the new facilities also reported a notable drop in attendance after delivery, as the girls had to cope with their new maternal responsibilities, and tended to become discouraged about being able to return to school. In particular, there was the problem of arranging for adequate substitute care of their infants.

The girls who were interviewed were asked also for their opinions as to why so many of the students were absent. Most felt that those who were excessively absent during pregnancy were "just lazy," or stayed home and "felt sorry for themselves." But they also emphasized realistic problems: illness stemming from the pregnancy, traveling difficulties during the last months of pregnancy, little money for proper clothing which made them feel embarrassed, family pressures, and lack of child care help. Related to this, more than half of the girls interviewed (N = 60) felt it was harder to attend school while pregnant.

Added to these factors in the District 3 facility was the lack of the supportive medical and counseling services, whose unavailability contributed to its higher absence rate. Almost no follow-up of those girls who were excessively absent was possible until the social worker was assigned to the facility. In addition, the facility's population, which was not primarily drawn from the local community, did not find it easily accessible by public transportation. And as was previously noted, the facility's quarters and its lunches did not tend to encourage attendance.

3. Academic Achievement During Attendance

The irregularity in attendance was, in addition, a significant factor in the degree to which the girls were able to maintain their grade levels and benefit from the instructional program. For 101 of the 363 girls, no course grades were able to be given (a grade of Absent was recorded) because of their excessive absences. Understandably, this group of girls found it more difficult to return to regular school partly because they had not maintained their grade level and faced an additional year of schooling.

For the 178 girls whose performance at the facilities could be graded, and for whom information on their prior school achievement was available, their level of achievement at the facility was compared with their achievement in regular school for the year prior to their admission. Their grades were averaged and scaled as follows: below passing (under 65), passing (65 to 70), above passing (71 to 80), and good to excellent (above 80).

Despite their being pregnant, 39 percent performed similarly at the facilities, i.e., they maintained their previous grade averages. In this group of 69 girls, only 13 percent had below passing averages in regular school and continued at this level at the facility. Thirty-one percent of the total of 178 improved their performance at the facilities, with 58 percent of this improved group (N = 55) going from below passing work to passing or above.

For 30 percent there was a downward movement, with the most able students prior to the pregnancy apparently most affected. Of this group of 54 students, 76 percent had been performing in the above passing to good to excellent range in regular school. This finding of academic improvement occurring more frequently among girls who were previously failing was also found in the study of "The Webster School."[1] It appears that the pregnancy tends to have more of a demoralizing impact on the better performing student.

Some of the improvement in, as well as maintenance of previous school performance can be attributed to the smaller classes and greater indiviual attention. In the group interviews, almost all of the girls cited the smaller classes as one of the advantages of the facilities, feeling that "more work was accomplished" and that they "got more attention."

In general, the girls who did attend regularly were able to maintain their grade level, if not advance in grade. Of the total of 178, 87 percent maintained or advanced their grade level. For 66 girls in particular, it meant no delay in their graduation from high school.

4. Student Appraisal of Facility Courses

The students who completed the questionnaire in the Districts 3, 4, and 13 facilities were asked to indicate those courses they found most and least helpful, as well as the courses they wanted to take but were not available to them at the facilities.

Table IV-12 gives the percentage distribution for the courses reported

---

[1] Marion Howard, The Webster School, A district of Columbia Program for Pregnant Girls, Washington, D.C.: U.S.D.H.E.W., Children's Bureau Research Reports, No. 2, 1968, p. 29

as most helpful. Typing and related business courses were perceived as of most value, being listed 33 percent of the time. English, social studies, mathematics, and the physical sciences were also considered helpful, in that order. The home economics course was viewed as less helpful, even though an attempt was made to focus on the kind of maternal responsibilities the girls will be assuming. This may reflect the girls' reaction to the abstract level on which this course was taught on the whole.

TABLE IV-12

COURSES REPORTED AS MOST HELPFUL ON STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

BY PERCENT

(N = 156*)

Most Helpful Courses	Percent Reported
English/Reading	**18.0**
Business courses, excluding typing	**18.0**
Typing	**15.0**
Social studies	**12.0**
Mathematics	**11.0**
Physical sciences	**8.0**
Home economics	**7.0**
All of the courses	**3.0**
Art (only in District 3)	**2.0**
None of the courses	**1.0**
Uncodable responses	**5.0**
Total	**100.0**

*** N includes the total frequencies for the courses, not respondents.**

The courses reported as least helpful are given in Table IV-13. The reduced number of responses (88 as compared to a total of 156 for the most helpful courses), as well as that none of the courses were reported as unhelpful 18 percent of the time, attests to the girls' approval in general of the course of instruction. Among the courses seen as least helpful, academic courses and the home economics sequence were mentioned more frequently than business education courses. This further confirms the interest in and value attached to the latter type of training.

TABLE IV-13

COURSES REPORTED AS LEAST HELPFUL ON STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

BY PERCENT

(N = 88*)

Least Helpful Courses	Percent Reported
None of the courses	18.0
English	14.0
Home economics	13.0
Social studies	11.0
Physical sciences	11.0
Business education courses	7.0
Mathematics	4.0
All of the courses	2.0
Art (only in District 3)	2.0
All except business course	1.0
Spanish	1.0
Uncodable responses	16.0
Total	100.0

---

[*] N includes the total frequencies for the courses, not respondents.

Table IV-14 presents the courses that were wanted but unavailable at the three facilities. In general, for the core courses offered in the facilities, e.g., social studies, mathematics, business education, etc., their being listed as unavailable by the students reflects apparently their not having been programmed for them, or that particular subjects within the sequence were not made available. One of the criticisms voiced in the group interviews was the lack of sufficient teachers to provide the range of subjects needed and/or wanted.

TABLE IV-14

COURSES WANTED, NOT AVAILABLE, REPORTED BY STUDENTS IN THREE FACILITIES

BY PERCENT

Type of Course	For Facilities In Dist. 3	Dist. 4	Dist. 13
Business courses including typing	19.0	25.0	20.0
Foreign languages	10.0	-	13.0
Physical sciences	32.0	-	3.0
None wanted	10.0	17.0	3.0
Art course	-	10.0	13.0
Music	6.5	8.0	-
Nursing, medical technician	-	10.0	3.0
Dressmaking, fashion art	-	2.5	13.0
Advanced mathematics	3.0	-	3.0
Social studies	6.5	-	-
Miscellaneous, e.g., swimming, cooking, agriculture	-	2.5	10.0
Uncodable responses	13.0	25.0	19.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N = 31*)	(N = 40*)	(N = 31*)

*N includes the total frequencies for the courses, not respondents.

At the same time, the girls were readily aware of the particular subject area deficiencies in two of the three facilities, in that 32 percent in the District 3 facility listed science courses, and 20 percent in District 13 business education courses. As might have been expected, there was a strong general demand for business skills training across the facilities. In addition, instruction in foreign languages, art (in those facilities without this subject), music, nursing, and dressmaking was basically requested.

From this student appraisal, it is clear that obtaining training in business skills while at the facilities is basically desired by the students. This is apparently an objective that doesn't need to be sold to them. Moreover, being able to secure such training might help to sustain these students in continuing their education. In addition, the girls were rightly critical of the facilities' lack of foreign language instruction and related academic subjects which, for some, tends to result in their being unable to meet the requirements for an academic diploma.

5. Student Appraisal of the Project

Both in the group interviews and on the questionnaire, the girls' reaction to the project was predominantly positive. Eighty-five percent of those participating in the interviews (N = 60), and 87 percent (N = 78) of those who completed the questionnaires preferred attending the facilities while pregnant to remaining in regular school. The handful who would have wanted to continue in their previous schools gave as the basis their being close to graduation and finding the facilities did not offer the courses they needed.

The girls not only recognized that the program enabled them to continue their education, but that it provided them also with needed activity while they waited out the pregnancy. Forty-one percent (N = 59) in the group interviews indicated that they would have "stayed home and done nothing" if the facilities had not been available to them.

As previously noted, 13 percent had indicated on the questionnaire their preference for remaining in these "special schools" which reflected in part the positive feeling toward the program. One student gave as her reason: "I would like to stay here because I learn a lot more than in regular school. . .this is the first school I really do like and the teachers, too."

Although a third of the girls interviewed thought they were "learning more" at the facilities, slightly more than half felt they were "learning less." They attributed this to the multigraded classes which held up some of them who "could work faster," to the lack of teachers and needed subjects, and to a lack of "patience" and acceptance on the part of some teachers.

A few further commented that the tests were "easier" and that at times they were marked rather leniently, which they felt might add to their difficulties when they returned to regular school. It was the interviewer's impression that the girls sensed their own deficiencies, particularly in language arts, and recognized that the higher grades they might receive might not actually reflect their level of functioning. But these would be the grades they would have "to live up to" once they returned to regular school.

There were additional criticisms concerning the physical settings and implementation of the project: in particular, the inadequate lunches they received in the District 3 and 4 facilities; the lack of space in District 13, as well as in District 4, and for the latter the number of flights they had to climb; and the lack of "good books to read," as well as a place in which to read them.

When asked for their recommendations for improving the project, they suggested "more schools like this one," and that the existence of the facilities should be "advertised" more within the regular ashools, with this being aimed toward the student population. As one student put it: "I wish it was possible for you to advertise these schools more because they are very helpful."

The basically favorable view of the program by the target population is perhaps best expressed in this student's written comment: "I was very happy to attend such a wonderful (school) and I will try to encourage other pregnant girls to attend and not drop out just because of the pregnancy."

CHAPTER V

THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

A. APPROACHES IN EVALUATION

As the primary objective of these educational facilities is to aid and encourage pregnant teenage girls to continue their studies with minimal interruption and to assist them in completing their education by attending school, the instructional program was examined to assess its effectiveness in reaching the stated objective.

To assess the instructional program classroom visitations were undertaken (at the facilities in Districts 3, 4, 12, and 13); individual conferences with teachers and facility administrators, as well as other staff members, such as guidance counsellors, nutritionists, and nursing personnel attached to the facilities were arranged, and through brief conversations, when the opportunity arose, some students' points of view were obtained. Such activities focused not only on the observable day-to-day situations but also included opportunities for a familiarization with daily schedules, with a variety of work plans, with available instructional materials, and with instructional accommodations.

B. DEVELOPMENT OF THE CURRICULUM

1. Bases for the Educational Program

The project's general plan was developed and organized to instruct pregnant teenage girls. As the girls enrolled for each facility, the majority of registrants were from secondary high schools and a minority from junior high schools. They ranged in age from eleven to twenty years with the median being sixteen years. Fifty-three percent of them were between 16 and 17 years old. Of these 363 students referred to before (Chapter IV) 76 students were in the junior high school level while the remainder (287) were in the secondary high school level and the eleventh grade was the median grade level. Thus both curriculum planning and implementation had to be focused on the abilities, needs, and requirements for both levels. The New York City Board of Education's curriculum manuals were used as guides. Courses adhered closely to the curriculum of regular public schools. But some areas were omitted or limited in scope, for example, foreign languages, science, music, and essential phases in the business education sequence. Such organization resulted from the limited positions for teaching staff members. However, effort was made to provide as continuous a program as possible by the staffs replicating those in which the girls had been assigned in their former schools. Organizational procedures similar to those in the regular schools were also followed.[1] The girls were assigned to homerooms and there were period changes to other classrooms for different subjects which were departmentalized. The periods were administratively scheduled, according to customary practice, for approximately 40 minutes.

---

[1] In addition to conforming to the regular school program during the official school year, summer school programs involving the respective facility staffs are in the process of development and implementation with the purpose of reinforcing components of a continuous educational program.

2. Scope of the Teachers' Tasks

Because of the limited teaching staff per facility, classes were generally multigraded. This was particularly true in such fundamental areas as English or Mathematics. Not only did the grade levels in which the students were placed give rise to multigrading, but the ability levels at which they functioned compounded performance differences. Thus, even though an English teacher might have been administratively responsible for six grades (seventh through twelfth grade) in his subject, he found his responsibility to be a much broader and a more complex one because of the range of ability among the girls, extending from "below average" to "college readiness." As the data on reading achievement (see Table IV-7) indicate, only 19 percent of the total tested functioned on or above grade level, while 55 percent were functioning three or more years below grade level. With reading as a related skill to other language arts skills, the scope of the English teacher's task is apparent. It could be expected also that such inadequacy of performance in communication skills would significantly affect the other curriculum areas. Thus, not only was there marked heterogenity in student performance and functioning in the language arts, but in other subject areas as well. Therefore, while planning for a tenth grade group, a teacher had to be concerned with the multi-leveling in several ways -- age, grade, function level, needs, potentialities.

Differences also were noted in the student-teacher ratio within a classroom; the basic student-teacher ratio shifted and changed, depending upon the subject area taught and the registration of the moment. A social studies teacher may have had a register of 18 in American History (11-12 grades) which remained so for only a brief time as students left when the time for the baby's birth drew near and their places were not filled. The register of this class often changed within six months. Or a given class such as Geometry, might be expected to have a small register, but because of new entrants, the register would be increased. Similarly, because of excused and unexcused absence, the size of class groups varied.

3. Application of Procedures and Approaches

Teacher planning called for a high degree of flexibility. High pupil transiency, movement in and out of the program, coupled with the high level of pupil absence, made it necessary for each teacher to be prepared to make changes, to adapt projected plans.

Generally, teacher-directed and teacher-centered developmental lessons took place. Sometimes, techniques in group discussion and interchange were used when the students had similar interests, background knowledge, and maturation. Such class lessons also occurred when a new idea or new basic content was introduced. In the latter situations, the introductory phase was sometimes followed by a period of time allotted for working with individual students. When educational assistants were involved as in the District 12 facility, such individualization was more likely to occur and to be less taxing for the teacher. In two of the new facilities college students also served in that capacity. Despite the inadequacy or limitations of such assistance, flexible organizations and groupings in some classrooms where the academic areas were studied gave evidence that some teachers were ready for, willing to, and concerned about developing each girl's individual potential. This was especially true where remediation in academic skills was needed. Unfortunately, the problems in helping the girls who were grossly retarded in reading were only superficially met for several reasons - among these, the girl's self-concept, her inner feelings, her acceptance of her condition. The comparatively brief enrollment time at the school limited the possibility of remediating the language weaknesses, including writing and speaking skills, which had become intensive and indurated. Approximately a fourth of the teachers recognized these obstacles. They were also aware of the girls' concern about their pregnancy - their feelings, and surely their fears.

At admission, the extent of the girls' pregnancies was from two months to post-partum (Table IV-6). It should be noted that approximately 50 percent of them were five or six months pregnant, respectively, in numbers 83 and 106, a total of 189 students. Realizing that the girls might have feelings of bewilderment and helplessness, their teachers felt that they must help the girls grasp and hold on to the belief that continuing in school was important to them personally, not only to help them through the change of role they were facing in the present, but also as a way of providing for the future. Because the teachers understood the important role that reading and other skills perform in all school studies and that success in accomplishment was an important tool in furthering encouragement, they provided as much time as possible for remediation. (However, even the encouragement for remediation in reading skills was weakened by the lack of many reading materials and books worth reading. Library facilities had not been developed, a condition which helped negate the intrinsic values of knowing how to read.) On the other hand, concomitantly with this awareness of the need for individual help in reading, a variety of planned activities by some home teachers of home economics and business education demonstrated similar consideration for individual interests, needs, and potentials. In one facility, an art teacher developed a completely individualized program. However, such possibilities were restrained by limited equipment and facilities. Adapting school activities to focus on individual needs depends upon more than content knowledge in subject areas. It would entail educational assistance in the form of knowledge of students' physical stamina and mental maturation, suitable school facilities and equipment, appropriate instructional materials, additional professional personnel and, what would be most important, the proficiency and know-how in projecting the mainstay (individualization) of the program.

Some teachers were cognizant that cooperative planning and undertakings could strengthen the efforts of each participant, e.g., by preventing unnecessary repetition, by practicing through application previously introduced skills or facts, by intensifying such knowledge through transference into an allied area, and by expanding the resources for interchange of ideas. These teachers purposefully developed their own styles of team teaching. Each suited the pattern of the respective facility's ambience. A home economics teacher worked closely with the facility's nurse in planning ideas for child care and specific content in Preparation for Family Living. A business education teacher enlisted the cooperation of the mathematics teacher in preparing instructional material in reviewing basic computational facts. A home economics teacher, a mathematics teacher, a social studies teacher (economics) and a business education teacher undertook a survey and study of neighborhood stores in relation to comparing prices and costs for shopping and budgeting based upon one's income. A language arts teacher worked with a social studies teacher in preparing a panel discussion on current affairs to be shared with the other students. Such cooperative approaches ultimately offered further techniques for better utilization and apportionment of each girl's attendance time at the facility.

Sometimes a teacher planned experiences which served as bases for activities and learning situations in other subject areas. For example, a mathematics teacher and her groups visited a New York State Employment Office and a Neighborhood Credit Union office to acquaint the girls with these facilities. Such trips furthered the transference of factual knowledge and helped to deepen conceptual understandings.

The teachers received some guidance and direction through the discussions which occurred at staff meetings and through observations by and individual conferences with facility administrators. Unfortunately, the time and energy of the latter were often expended in administrative duties that limited their time for working with the teachers.

During the general conference held in 1969 at the Center for Urban Education's headquarters, the consensus of the teachers was that communication and exchange of ideas among the teaching staffs would further their professional awareness and know-how in developing meaningful teaching-learning experiences for each of their students. They would welcome any opportunities arranged for such purpose.

C. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

As a result of the classroom visits, the interviews, the conferences, and the informal conversations with the various concerned groups, a number of ideas for improving and furthering in particular the instructional program of these educational facilities were projected and are presented here as recommendations.

1. An Individualized Instructional Program

Even though the schools are directed to follow the program of the New York City public schools because of the project's stated objective . . . "continuing educational program . . . to enable them (the girls) to ultimately meet requirements for a high school diploma. . .," it is suggested that the same objective may be achieved without adhering to the structures followed by the public secondary schools. These are schools for special education. Therefore, it is recommended that while the content of the official curriculum be followed, consideration should be given to approaches, procedures, methods, and techniques which would allow for more flexible programming and a greater amount of individualization, based upon the needs and interests of the students. Studies and research offer no evidence that structured formal organization makes for better teaching-learning situations.[2] Because these are facilities for special education there should be a variety of programs and organizations which provide options from which to select the specific approach which would help the girls most.

2. Student Orientation

When the girls are enrolled, it is often difficult to obtain the necessary records from the home schools. The girls' self-evaluation of their academic status is not always accurate nor specific. It is accordingly recommended that as soon as a girl is admitted an assessment procedure starting with a group conference be considered. At this conference, the student (or students) would meet the facility administrator, guidance counselor, the nurse (if available), the social worker, and designated teaching personnel (perhaps the English and/or mathematics teachers) in order for the staff and student to become acquainted. For a better understanding of each girl's abilities and needs, survey tests in English and mathematics would need to be administered as well as all other relevant anecdotal data reviewed. During the week of admission, consideration should be given also to having the new enrollee visit different classrooms so as to become familiar with the program of the facility, its staff, and students. Such an orientation process should result in better placement for grouping and individual work.

---

[2] Dwight W. Allen and Frederick J. McDonald, "The Effects of Self-Selection on Learning in Programmed Instruction," American Educational Research Journal, 1-6, Jan. 1966; Sarane Babcock, "Toward a Sociology of Learning: A Selective Review of Existing Research," Sociology of Education, Winter 1966, p. 1-45; B. Frank Brown, The Appropriate Placement School: A Sophisticated Nongraded Curriculum, West Nyack, N.Y.: Parker Publishing Company, 1965; John I. Goodlad, Planning and Organizing for Teaching, Project on Instruction, Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1963; D. Gottlieb, "Some Social Aspects of the Teacher-Student Interaction Process," Perspectives on Learning, New York: Mental Health Materials Center Inc., 1967; Robert R. Leeper, et al., Nurturing Individual Potential, Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1964; P.C. Sexton, ed., Readings on the School in Society, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967; Robert J. Soar, "Optimum Teacher-Pupil Interaction for Pupil Growth," Educational Leadership, 275-280, Dec., 1968; and Fred J. Wilhelms, et al., A Climate for Individuality, Washington, D.C.: NEA American Association of School Administrators, 1965.

3. A Curriculum Coordinator

The facility administrator's role includes a wide spectrum of responsibilities. Because of the unique purpose of these schools for continuing education, the major portion of the administrator's time is given to communicating and working with various institutions, e.g., health services, with community organizations, and with other related educational departments. Thus, it is recommended that a curriculum coordinator be assigned who would cooperate with the facility administrators in developing and adapting curriculum to meet specific needs. Additionally, the administrators, facility staff, and community representatives should be involved with the coordinator in exploring and determining the curriculum tasks which should be addressed. As this coordinator would service all the facilities, many new developments could be implemented by such a liaison.

4. Teacher Training

The present selected teachers demonstrate an intensity and dedication in their desire to carry out their teaching tasks and they do seek guidance in many phases. Therefore, it is recommended that as part of the curriculum coordinator's responsibility:

a. A continuous inservice training program should be conducted. None of the present teachers have had any previous teaching experience with pregnant girls. These teachers must know more about the physical and psychological needs of these girls and how to interpret these needs in classroom procedures, e.g., the level of fatigue of the girls is often overlooked in scheduling periods. Another phase of the program would concentrate upon the exploration of new teaching techniques, including various approaches in team teaching involving interaction and relationships among peers, educational assistants, paraprofessionals, and other resource personnel.

b. There should be scheduled periodic meetings of subject-matter personnel to become acquainted, to interchange ideas, and to offer encouragement and stimulation to each other. For the same reasons similar meetings should be scheduled for the guidance counselors.

5. Facility Administrators' Meetings

It is of utmost importance that the heads of facilities have periodic meetings, both as a group and also with the person-in-charge at central headquarters. Discussions focusing on guidelines for specific undertakings, requirements for certain projects, assistance in obtaining personnel, and other similar concerns will be a means of sharing the unique abilities of each participant. These meetings should be regularly held not only to exchange new ideas or further other ideas, but also to prevent unnecessary difficulties and disturbances.

6. Instructional Materials

It is true that this is the first year of operation for four of these schools and it takes time to provide many basic things, but the first facility to be set up — in District 12 — is still lacking many basic materials and equipment, as well as space, because it has not been relocated. It is recommended that continuous effort be made to supply the needed educational tools:

a. The basic machines for the business education sequence.
b. Textbooks in the various areas.
c. Maps.
d. Science equipment and materials.
e. A library — not only as a reading room, but as a reference room, and as a study room.
f. Audiovisual facilities — machines, such as filmstrip projectors, overhead projectors, tape recorders, etc. — as well as the accompanying tapes and filmstrips.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

A. CONCLUSIONS

The current evaluation confirms the basic conclusion of the prior one, namely, that this program is meeting a valid and felt need of the community by providing educational facilities previously unavailable to pregnant school-age girls. As was previously found, a majority of the students discharged from the program do return to school, or have graduated, and those currently in the program are motivated to continue. This has been achieved despite the fact that the new facilities which were established had to operate under less than optimal conditions. In point of fact, the success of the program can be largely attributed to the involvement, spirit, and dedication of the respective facility administrators and their staffs.

Further, this evaluation reinforces the importance of the educational program being closely coordinated with a comprehensive array of social welfare and medical/health services. It is evident that maximal utilization of the facilities and greater participation in the program more readily occurs when community-based supportive services are equally available.

In general, the project appears to be succeeding with those students who are closer to graduation and aspiring to achieve academic and commercial diplomas, i.e., the more educationally motivated student. The organization and functioning of the facilities further supports this, for they are essentially an organizational modification in the provision of educational services, rather than one exemplifying a basic change in educational approach or in instructional methods. The program appears not to be reaching a smaller, but still sizable group, who discontinue attending the facilities while pregnant and who eventually terminate their education. The basis for this is not altogether clear, as it would have required a more extended evaluation, i.e., a comprehensive follow-up study which would have focused in part on this "dropout" population.

A more extended evaluation is needed as well to adequately assess the full impact of this program's "holding power," i.e., its effectiveness in sustaining the girls' attendance upon return to regular school. It was again evident that most of the girls served by the program need two or more years to complete their education after the interruption of the pregnancy. But until the program had been in operation for a minimum of two years, and had served at least 200 students, this kind of an assessment was not feasible. This limited evaluation can only corroborate the prior judgment of the program's short-term effectiveness.

B. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The principal recommendations concerning the further development and operation of this program follow:

1. The project should be recycled for the coming school year. At the same time, its citywide coordination and assignment of teaching staff positions should be reconsidered.

Instead of the citywide coordination continuing to be vested in a headquarters staff assistant superintendent assigned to the Junior High School Division, it is recommended that these facilities be placed under the supervision of the Office of Special Education and Pupil Personnel Services at central headquarters. Throughout its many years of service this office has had considerable experience with children of various ages in a multitude of problem situations.

Furthermore, as of September 1969, New York City's regular high schools have been placed under the aegis of the High School Division at central headquarters. One of the reasons given is that senior high school students come from a wider geographical area as compared with elementary and junior high school students who attend district oriented schools. This applies equally to the facilities' students who, moreover, are predominantly at the high school level. In view of this and the "special education" component in this program, its supervision by the Office of Special Education seems singularly appropriate.

Placement under this office may also help to remedy the continuing problem of inadequate lunches for the facilities in Districts 3, 4, 12, and 18.

Consideration should be given to allocating a sixth teacher to each facility in order to meet the range of educational needs of the target population. It is further recommended that the budget allowance for teaching staff be interpreted as the total salary of six positions and the facility administrator have the option of making part-time assignments rather than appoint six full-time staff. This would be in accord with the concept of flexible programming, and administrators may find it more valuable to assign part-time teachers for remedial reading, in a foreign language, or in art and music.

2. If these facilities are to perform optimally, it is essential for the future that firm arrangements be made for the provision of the comprehensive array of social welfare and medical services needed. Every effort should be expended to have the agreements implemented, even partially, by the cooperating agencies in District 3.

The policy on location, to provide easy access to medical and health services, if possible by coordinating the program with a neighborhood health center, should be continued.

3. The relocation of the District 12 facility still has not been implemented, although it was previously reported that the lack of adequate space interfered with the full development of its program.

In addition, the renovation and/or relocation, as well as the equipping of these four new facilities needs to be expedited. Continued effort should also be made to reduce the persisting delays in securing allocated supplies.

Furthermore, in planning the establishment of a new facility, a representative nucleus composed of the potential facility administrator, a school secretary, and an eligible teaching staff member should be assigned at least six months in advance to prepare and ready the new facility for operation. Such pre-planning would not only provide a more comfortable facility with better learning conditions for the girls, but would also tend to improve communication between the facility and central system staff.

4. This program should be expanded to accommodate all pregnant school-age girls who want to continue their education. Particular consideration should be given to establishing a facility in Queens.

5. Additional ways of disseminating information about this program within the school system should be explored in order to reach all of the eligible target population.

6. When indicated, students should be permitted to attend the facility for one year, or to complete the school year in which they were admitted. This would sustain the students' contacts with staff, and enable them to assist those students having difficulty in planning for care of their infants.

7. As previously recommended, infant day-care centers should be considered as possible adjuncts to the facilities. This would serve to help students remain in school, and might become the basis for a course in baby nursing for students interested in this vocation.

8. Since the program will have been in operation for more than two years at the conclusion of this phase, a comprehensive follow-up study with the dual objectives outlined above should be considered.

In addition to these general recommendations, specific suggestions for strengthening the instructional program have been presented at the end of the preceding Chapter which focused exclusively on the educational component of this project.

ADDENDUM

REPORT ON SUMMER PROGRAM OF THE FACILITIES IN DISTRICTS 3, 4, 13, AND 18

A. INTRODUCTION

From its inception, this project was expected to provide educational instruction on a year-round basis by having the facilities open during the summer in addition to the regular school year. The summer session was apparently viewed as a further means of reducing the pregnant girl's time out of regular school, as well as extending the program's capacity for serving the target population. The educational objectives, of course, were the same and, accordingly, the core instructional program previously described was to be offered both during the regular school year and the summer. At the same time, the possibility of utilizing the summer school program as traditionally interpreted, i.e., of enabling the facilities' students to make up course and/or Regents failures, or to improve their grade standing was also incorporated.

In point of fact, the summer program instituted in the five facilities comprising this project appears to be essentially patterned after the intensive six-week summer school session regularly provided for secondary school students by the Board of Education. It also functions for six weeks, four hours daily, without making any provision for lunch. It has further attempted to hold to the same attendance standard, i.e., a maximum of three absences on which course credit is dependent in the regular summer high schools.

As indicated in the main body of this report, the four new facilities began operating in July 1968. The current evaluation of this program, however, was to encompass the period from September 1968 through August 1969. Accordingly, only the 1969 summer program (from 7/7/69 through 8/15/69) in the four new facilities has been included. The District 12 facility has again been excluded because of the prior decision not to include it in the overall evaluation. A separate descriptive report on its 1968 summer program, however, was also previously prepared.

1. Assessment of Summer Program

The evaluation of the four facilities' summer programs represents essentially an extension of the assessment undertaken by the evaluation team of the regular school year project. This was necessitated by the limited amount of time allotted for the evaluation as a whole.

With regard to the summer program established, its organization and implementation was assessed through observation and contacts with facility administrators, guidance counselors, and social work staff by the evaluation director. Limited background data on the new girls registered for the summer session by the facilities were also obtained. This was in addition to the data already available on those students previously registered at the respective facilities who decided to attend the summer session, i.e., the "holdover" group.

In addition, specific attendance data for the entire summer session pupil register were obtained for the District 3, 4, and 13 facilities. In District 18, only an approximate rate of attendance was available.

Since almost all of the new summer admissions to the four facilities were expected to be still attending them in the fall, because of their stage of pregnancy, no data regarding their disposition and/or plans were obtained. The holdover group, on the other hand, has been included in the findings already reported regarding the students' overall response to this project.

B. PHYSICAL ARRANGEMENTS, OPERATION OF SUMMER PROGRAM

1. Physical Arrangements

The physical settings were as previously described, but were faced with the additional problem of the summer heat. As has been noted in Chapter III, the District 13 facility had to keep its front door open if it were to operate at all. The physical discomfort experienced by both staff and students, as a result of their occupying non-air-conditioned premises in conjunction with the absence of any fans, was clearly evident. It seemed to be particularly difficult for those students who were in the last trimester of their pregnancies.

This was in contrast to the operation of the summer program at the District 12 facility which appeared feasible since the facility was housed in an air-conditioned maternity center. Apparently, the need for these new facilities to be air-conditioned, or at the least supplied with sufficient fans, was not considered in the planning for them to remain operational during the summer recess.

2. No Lunch Program

Because the girls were expected to be dismissed by 1:00 o'clock, no provision was made for them to receive lunch. Nevertheless, the population being served was in need of nutritional supplementation, mostly because of their pregnant status, but also because of the energy required for them to cope with a full school program scheduled during a shorter time period.

The administrator of the District 4 facility did provide lunch, primarily because this facility had received the necessary food storage equipment and had access to some unutilized funds. On the other hand, in the District 3 facility only milk could be served to the students. The other two facilities did attempt to serve additional snacks, but this did not adequately substitute for a regular lunch.

3. Coordination with Medical/Social Services

The cooperative arrangements previously described continued in Districts 4, 13, and 18. However, it was found that the heat, combined with the tight scheduling needed to include all of the prescribed educational content, resulted in the suspension of the group counseling sessions for the summer in the District 13 and 18 facilities. The District 3 facility, of course, continued to be without access to medical and/or hospital services.

4. Staffing of the Summer Program

The regular staffs of the four facilities, professional and paraprofessional, by and large staffed the summer program, although it was evidently enervating, particularly for the administrative personnel. The latter had had to contend with many operational difficulties, as previously documented, in establishing these facilities as fully functioning units.

In each of the four facilities, some of the teaching staff and/or guidance counselors had to be replaced for the summer; this was apparently accomplished with little difficulty. In fact, the District 13 facility was able to secure a teacher of business education for the summer who taught at one of the local high schools. The availability of most of the regular staff did provide continuity, and enabled the core instructional program to be offered with almost no interruption.

It should be noted that the District 4 facility had, in addition, a remedial reading teacher who was engaged through state funds allotted to the facility's district. It also secured an additional educational assistant from the Urban Summer Corps for a total of five such assistants.

5. Summer Instructional Program

The facilities attempted to provide the basic instructional program, which included business skills training and home economics, within the shorter school day. At the same time, there appeared to be a greater emphasis on remediation partly due to the enrollment of a substantial group of previously registered students trying to make up educational deficiencies, e.g., twelfth graders who wanted to raise their reading levels in order to qualify for diplomas, and in part to the reduced summer enrollment.

Because of the latter, both holdover students and the newly admitted could receive more individualized instruction.

Although the provision of the basic instructional program was geared toward helping the girls maintain, if not improve, their grade standing, this proved difficult to achieve. Basically, this can be attributed to the continuing pattern of irregular attendance which limited the student's ability to cover the course's content in the time allotted, although the instruction was as intensively scheduled as in regular summer high school sessions.

This presented a more difficult grading problem as well to the summer teaching staff. The attendance standard utilized by the regular summer high schools could not be applied as almost none of the students would receive course credit. Concomitantly, given the nature of the population being served, absences due to clinic attendance, delivery and postpartum recovery, illness associated with the pregnancy, etc., were inevitable. In the absence of any specific guidelines, the staffs of the various facilities tended to develop their own standards regarding the number of allowable absences in relation to the granting of course credit.

The attempt to maintain the basic instructional program despite the shortened school day led to the temporary suspension of the course concerned with the impact of pregnancy in the District 3, 13, and 18 facilities. Two sessions with the physician who regularly taught the course were arranged during the summer at the District 13 facility for the newly admitted girls, in particular, after the regular school schedule. On those days, the girls were asked to bring their lunches.

In the District 4 facility, however, the courses on pregnancy and infant and child care could still be scheduled because of the provision of lunch. These courses, as well as individual tutoring sessions with the educational assistants, were able to be scheduled for the students after the lunch hour.

In the District 18 facility, a course in the use of the IBM keypunch machine was offered to almost all of the summer registrants. The machine had been installed just prior to the start of the summer session.

As was expected, almost no extracurricular activities were planned on the facilities' premises because they were not insulated from the heat. However, the District 18 facility did have a closing exercise in the form of a Community Open House which reviewed the accomplishments of the first year of the facility's existence. Some outings for the girls attending this facility were also arranged through the Brownsville Community Council.

6. Admission, Intake and Discharge Practices

The admission criteria, intake and discharge practices previously described were continued without any change in the summer program. If anything, all four facilities tended to be rather more flexible in their admission policies during the summer because of the generally lower registration.

C. POPULATION SERVED BY SUMMER PROGRAM

1. Population Enrolled

The total number of girls registered by the four facilities was 141, distributed as follows: 20 (10 new admissions, 10 holdovers) in the District 3 facility; 35 (22 new admissions, 13 holdovers) in District 4's facility; 38 (21 new admissions, 17 holdovers) for the facility in District 13; and 48 (23 new admissions, 25 holdovers) in the District 18 facility. Of the 141 girls, 76, or 54 percent, were newly admitted, and because of their being primarily in the second trimester of pregnancy were likely to remain at the facilities beyond the summer session. As occurred during the regular school year, the newly admitted girls continued to be drawn from wider areas than the facilities' respective school districts.

Again, it was apparent that the District 3 facility was underutilized. This was not surprising as no change in its physical setting and/or accessibility to medical and health services had occurred in the interim. Furthermore, this lower total registration meant that the daily attendance was also lower than in the other facilities. Given this small registration, some of the facility's teaching staff questioned the advisability of continuing to operate during the summer.

As for their sociocultural characteristics, the population registered for the summer program tended to be identical to the population served during the regular school year at the four facilities.

2. Age at Admission to the Summer Program

The age range of the group of 141 girls was from 14 years to 20 years with the median age being 17 years. Only 15 percent of these students were 15 years or younger, whereas 52 percent were between 16 and 17 years of age. Another 27 percent were 18 years and older.

This differs somewhat from the age distribution found during the regular school year in that the median age at admission was 16 years (N = 363). This may indicate that the pregnant girls who are ready to enroll in a summer program are likely to be older. However, the summer sample was relatively small in size, and, consequently, its age distribution may be more the result of chance.

3. Grade Level at Admission to the Summer Program

The grade levels of the 141 girls ranged from the seventh through the twelfth grades. Four percent were in the seventh and eighth grades, 22 percent in the ninth grade, and 28 percent, 21 percent, and 25 percent in the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades respectively. The median grade level was the tenth which was a grade lower than the median for the 363 girls constituting the regular school year evaluation group.

This finding in conjunction with the older average age of the girls enrolled for the summer program underscores the degree to which remedial instruction seems to be needed. Although somewhat more grade retardation relative to age is apparent in the summer program sample, the group as a whole does not appear to be that different from the population registered during the regular school year.

4. Attendance in the Summer Program

Through the first week in August, the median number of days absent was five for the 93 girls registered at the facilities in Districts 3, 4, and 13. For the 20 girls in District 3, the range of days absent was from none to 18 with a median of 7.5 days. For the District 4 facility (N = 35), the range was one day to 16 days with a median of five days. In District 13 (N = 38), the range was no days absent to 13 days with a median of five days. Although data on actual attendance could not be obtained for the District 18 facility's student register, it was ascertained that an average of 30 students attended daily.

In the rate of absence reported for the three facilities, absences due to delivery and postpartum recovery were excluded. A number of the girls did deliver during the six-week summer session, and their rate of absence tended to be high just prior to this event. The attendance of this group tended to be so minimal that course credit was seldom earned.

To the factors previously identified as contributing to the irregular attendance of this population group should be added the debilitation due to the summer's heat. Traveling to the facilities, as well as having to learn in hot, uncomfortable quarters, contributed to this.

5. Level of Achievement

Three girls were enabled to graduate high school from the four facilities because of their attendance in the summer program. An additional five girls were possible graduates depending on their rate of absence. About a third of the girls who were enrolled would not be able to earn course credit and/or maintain their grade standing because of their limited attendance.

D. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is apparent that incorporation of a summer program has tended to extend the scope of the project, and to further support the objective of enabling pregnant school-age girls to complete their education. At the same time, the specific educational objectives and/or basic focus of this summer component appear to have received little consideration. Even less consideration appears to have been given to the physical aspects of pregnant students attending school in the summer time in planning for the inclusion of a summer program for this project.

Essentially, the educational effectiveness of duplicating the regular school year instructional program in the summer is questioned in view of the fact that at least a third of the students enrolled do not attend regularly enough to earn course credit. It is likely that the rate of absence might be somewhat reduced if the facilities were air-conditioned, and provision were made for all of them to serve lunch. But there would still be an irreducible number of absences due to the condition of pregnancy which would still tend to mitigate against the girls being able to cover the amount of work required to earn course credit in an intensive summer session of six weeks.

A possible alternative educational focus might be that of providing intensive remedial instruction combined perhaps with a greater emphasis on business skills training. The basic need for remediation, as well as its not being able to be consistently provided during the regular school year, has been documented in the preceding report. A remediation focus is further supported by the relatively greater grade retardation of the population which appears to be primarily served by the summer program. But it might still be possible, even with this basic focus, to provide the necessary academic course instruction for those students attempting to graduate, or who do manage to attend regularly, if the kind of individualized approach suggested in the chapter on the instructional program were implemented. Furthermore, a greater emphasis on business skills training is being suggested because of the apparent inability to program such training for all of the students who want it during the regular school year. Some of the skills involved can be learned within the limited time span of the summer session.

Considering both the enervation experienced by the staff of the four facilities, most of whom function on a year-round basis, as well as the physical condition of the students served, air-conditioning of all the facilities should be undertaken. In point of fact, this would seem to be a fundamental provision for any educational program which intends to operate on a year-round basis. For the District 13 facility, moreover, it would help to reduce the risk of uncontrolled access to which it is particularly vulnerable in the summer.

Finally, the provision of lunch is recommended in order to meet the nutritional needs of this target population, and to allow for greater flexibility in programming, as was evident at the District 4 facility.

In summary, the summer program at these four facilities appears to have contributed in part to the achievement of the project's primary objective and should be continued. But it also needs to be basically reviewed and strengthened, if it is to become maximally effective.

APPENDIX A

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Population at Four Facilities from Inception through May 1969	A1
2	Source of Referral (From Record Data)	A2
3	Source of Referral (From Student Questionnaire)	A3
4	Time Interval Before Entering Facility for Districts 3, 4, 13 (From Student Questionnaire)	A4
5	Age at Admission to the Four Facilities	A5
6	Grade Level at Admission to the Four Facilities	A6
7	Stage of Pregnancy at Admission to the Four Facilities	A7
8	Reading Level of Students Tested at the Four Facilities	A8
9	Length of Attendance of Students Discharged by May 1969 in Three Facilities	A9
10	Length of Attendance of Students on Register June 1969 in Four Facilities	A10
11	Disposition or Plans as of June 1969 of Population Registered by the Four Facilities	A11
12	Students' Goals as Reported on Questionnaire	A12
13	Courses Reported as Most Helpful on Student Questionnaire	A13
14	Courses Reported as Least Helpful on Student Questionnaire	A14
15	Courses Wanted, Not Available, Reported by Students in Three Facilities	A15

TABLE 1

POPULATION AT FOUR FACILITIES FROM INCEPTION THROUGH MAY 1969*

(N = 518)

	Facility In				
Status of Population	**Dist. 3**	**Dist. 4**	**Dist. 13**	**Dist. 18**	**Total**
On register as of May 1969	44	71	67	47	229
Discharged as of May 1969 - attended 10 days or more	20	67	78	42	207
Discharged - registered but attended less than 10 days	14	21	22	25	82
Total	78	159	167	114	518

*Includes students registered for the 1968 summer session.

TABLE 2

SOURCE OF REFERRAL
(FROM RECORD DATA)

BY PERCENT

(N = 363)

Source of Referral	To Facilities In Dist. 3	Dist. 4	Dist. 13	Dist. 18	Total
Hospitals/Clinics	33.0	48.3	34.0	26.0	37.0
School personnel	16.0	14.0	22.0	30.0	19.0
Friends/Facility students	17.0	2.5	17.0	8.0	11.0
Social service agencies	27.0	-	8.0	2.0	8.0
Community persons	3.0	0.9	5.0	4.0	3.0
Parent/Relatives	3.0	2.5	4.0	-	3.0
Self-referral	-	3.0	1.0	-	2.0
Information unavailable	1.0	28.8	9.0	30.0	17.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N = 64)	(N = 118)	(N = 134)	(N = 47)	(N = 363)

THE MARGINAL LEGIBILITY OF THIS PAGE IS DUE TO POOR ORIGINAL COPY. BETTER COPY WAS NOT AVAILABLE AT THE TIME OF FILMING. E.D.R.S.

TABLE 3

SOURCE OF REFERRAL
(FROM STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE)

BY PERCENT

(N = 78)

Source of Referral	From Girls In Dist. 3	 Dist. 4	 Dist. 13	 Total
Hospital personnel	42.0	24.0	45.0	35.0
School personnel	29.0	38.0	40.0	36.0
Friends/Facility students	4.0	29.0	5.0	15.0
Parent/Relatives	21.0	-	5.0	8.0
Social service personnel	4.0	9.0	5.0	6.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N = 24)	(N = 34)	(N = 20)	(N = 78)

TABLE 4

TIME INTERVAL BEFORE ENTERING FACILITY FOR DISTRICTS 3, 4, 13 (FROM STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE)

BY PERCENT

(N = 78)

Time Interval	Dist. 3	Dist. 4	Dist. 13	Total
Within one week	25.0	23.0	20.0	23.0
Within same month	29.0	27.0	20.0	26.0
One month later	25.0	32.0	25.0	28.0
Two months later	4.0	-	25.0	8.0
Three months later	4.0	12.0	-	6.0
Not answered	13.0	6.0	10.0	9.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N = 24)	(N = 34)	(N = 20)	(N = 78)

TABLE 5

AGE AT ADMISSION TO THE FOUR FACILITIES

BY PERCENT

(N = 363)

	To Facilities In				
Age at Admission	Dist. 3	Dist. 4	Dist. 13	Dist. 18	Total
11 to 13 years	-	0.9	-	4.0	0.8
14 years	16.0	9.3	7.5	9.0	9.6
15 years	20.0	16.1	22.4	15.0	19.0
16 years	28.0	32.2	21.6	28.0	27.0
17 years	16.0	27.1	32.1	21.0	26.2
18 years and over	20.0	14.4	15.7	23.0	17.1
Information unavailable	-	-	0.7	-	0.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N = 64)	(N = 118)	(N = 134)	(N = 47)	(N = 363)

TABLE 6

GRADE LEVEL AT ADMISSION TO THE FOUR FACILITIES BY PERCENT

(N = 363)

Grade Level	Facilities In Dist. 3	Dist. 4	Dist. 13	Dist. 18	Total
6th and 7th grades	-	3.0	0.7	6.0	2.0
8th grade	3.0	6.0	5.2	6.0	5.0
9th grade	16.0	15.0	13.0	11.0	13.8
10th grade	23.0	22.0	29.1	21.0	24.8
11th grade	31.0	26.0	30.0	24.0	28.1
12th grade	25.0	28.0	22.0	32.0	26.0
Information unavailable	2.0	-	-	-	0.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N = 64)	(N = 118)	(N = 134)	(N = 47)	(N = 363)

TABLE 7

STAGE OF PREGNANCY AT ADMISSION TO THE FOUR FACILITIES BY PERCENT

(N = 363)

	Facilities In				
Stage of Pregnancy	Dist. 3	Dist. 4	Dist. 13	Dist. 18	Total
First trimester	16.0	11.0	14.0	11.0	13.0
Second trimester	59.0	74.0	70.0	62.0	68.0
Third trimester	20.0	13.0	16.0	23.0	17.0
Postpartum	3.0	2.0	-	2.0	1.4
Information unavailable	2.0	-	-	2.0	0.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N = 64)	(N = 118)	(N = 134)	(N = 47)	(N = 363

TABLE 8

READING LEVEL OF STUDENTS TESTED AT THE FOUR FACILITIES

BY PERCENT

(N = 297)

	Students In				
Reading Level	Dist. 3	Dist. 4	Dist. 13	Dist. 18	Total
1 to 4 grades above	12.0	10.0	5.0	8.0	8.0
At grade	14.0	11.0	8.0	22.0	11.0
1 to 2 grades below	31.0	26.0	25.0	24.0	26.0
3 to 4 grades below	23.0	34.0	52.0	32.0	40.0
5 to 6 grades below	16.0	16.0	8.0	11.0	12.0
7 grades or more below	4.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	3.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N = 49)	(N = 83)	(N = 128)	(N = 37)	(N = 297)

TABLE 9

LENGTH OF ATTENDANCE OF STUDENTS DISCHARGED BY MAY 1969 IN THREE FACILITIES BY PERCENT

(N = 134)

	Facilities In			
Length of Attendance	Dist. 3	Dist. 4	Dist. 13	Total
1 to 3 months	55.0	66.0	49.0	56.0
4 to 6 months	40.0	30.0	46.0	40.0
7 to 9 months	5.0	4.0	5.0	4.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N = 20)	(N = 47)	(N = 67)	(N = 134)

TABLE 10

LENGTH OF ATTENDANCE OF STUDENTS ON REGISTER JUNE 1969 IN FOUR FACILITIES BY PERCENT

(N = 229)

Length of Attendance	Facilities In Dist. 3	Dist. 4	Dist. 13	Dist. 18	Total
1 to 3 months	22.0	20.0	40.0	43.0	31.0
4 to 6 months	39.0	59.0	48.0	57.0	51.0
7 to 9 months	32.0	20.0	12.0	-	16.0
10 to 12 months	7.0	1.0	-	-	2.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N = 44)	(N = 71)	(N = 67)	(N = 47)	(N = 229)

TABLE 11

DISPOSITION OR PLANS AS OF JUNE 1969 OF POPULATION REGISTERED BY THE FOUR FACILITIES

BY PERCENT

(N = 518)

Disposition/Plans	Percent
Discharge/Returned to regular school	26.0
At facility/Plan to return to regular school	23.0
"Dropped out"/Discharged for non-attendance at facility	15.0
Not returning to school due to home, child care problems	11.0
Graduated high school from facility	10.0
At facility/Plans uncertain	10.0
Not returning to school/Employed or in training program	2.0
Unable to attend due to illness	1.0
Other disposition	2.0
Total	100.0

TABLE 12

STUDENTS' GOALS AS REPORTED ON QUESTIONNAIRE

BY PERCENT

(N = 78)

Goals	Percent
Return to regular school	55.0
Care for baby/Then employment	15.0
Continue school at facility	13.0
Go to college	9.0
Continue school if baby cared for	4.0
Stay home with baby	3.0
Plans uncertain	1.0
Total	100.0

TABLE 13

COURSES REPORTED AS MOST HELPFUL ON STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

BY PERCENT

(N = 156*)

Most Helpful Courses	Percent Reported
English/Reading	18.0
Business courses, excluding typing	18.0
Typing	15.0
Social studies	12.0
Mathematics	11.0
Physical sciences	8.0
Home economics	7.0
All of the courses	3.0
Art (only in District 3)	2.0
None of the courses	1.0
Uncodable responses	5.0
Total	100.0

*N includes the total frequencies for the courses, not respondents.

TABLE 14

COURSES REPORTED AS LEAST HELPFUL ON STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

BY PERCENT

(N = 88*)

Least Helpful Courses	Percent Reported
None of the courses	18.0
English	14.0
Home economics	13.0
Social studies	11.0
Physical sciences	11.0
Business education courses	7.0
Mathematics	4.0
All of the courses	2.0
Art (only in District 3)	2.0
All except business course	1.0
Spanish	1.0
Uncodable responses	16.0
Total	100.0

---

*N includes the total frequencies for the courses, not respondents.

TABLE 15

COURSES WANTED, NOT AVAILABLE, REPORTED BY STUDENTS IN THREE FACILITIES

BY PERCENT

Type of Course	For Facilities In		
	Dist. 3	Dist. 4	Dist. 13
Business courses including typing	19.0	25.0	20.0
Foreign languages	10.0	-	13.0
Physical sciences	32.0	-	3.0
None wanted	10.0	17.0	3.0
Art course	-	10.0	13.0
Music	6.5	8.0	-
Nursing, medical technician	-	10.0	3.0
Dressmaking, fashion art	-	2.5	13.0
Advanced mathematics	3.0	-	3.0
Social studies	6.5	-	-
Miscellaneous, e.g., swimming, cooking, agriculture	-	2.5	10.0
Uncodable responses	13.0	25.0	19.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(N = 31*)	(N = 40*)	(N = 31*)

---

*N includes the total frequencies for the courses, not respondents.

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENTS

Page

Interview Guide for Project Administrators B1

Questionnaire for Teaching Personnel B6

Record Form A B11

Record Form B B14

Interview Guide for Group Interviews with Girls Attending Educational Facilities B16

Questionnaire for Students Following Group Interview B19

Center for Urban Education

Educational Facilities for Pregnant School Age Girls

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR PROJECT ADMINISTRATORS

Date of Interview ____________ Administrator of District Center: ______

A. Background Information

1. Sex

____ Male ____ Female

2. Age as of last birthday

____ 20-25

____ 26-30

____ 31-40

____ 41-50

____ 51 or more

3. Educational background (indicate type of degree & specify major field)

____ College degree: specify major field ______________________

____ College degree plus some graduate work: specify extent of graduate work and field of concentration

____

____

____ Master's degree: specify field ______________________

____ Doctorate: specify field ______________________

____ Other educational training: specify ______________________

____

4. List N.Y.C. Board of Education licenses held:

______________________ ______________________

______________________ ______________________

______________________ ______________________

____ Regular ____ Substitute license(s)

B. Prior Teaching Experience

1. Total number of years of teaching experience

____ Less than one year

____ One to two years

____ Three to five years

____ Six to ten years

____ Eleven to fifteen years

____ Sixteen years or more

2. Where teaching has been done

____ In New York City only

____ In New York City and suburbs

____ Other geographic areas (specify) ____________________

____

3. Subject areas taught prior to joining educational facility:

____

____

4. Grades taught prior to joining educational facility:

____

____

5. Any prior experience with special school programs:
(e.g., home instruction, "600" schools, retarded children, school dropouts, etc.) specify type and length of experience:

____

____

____

____

C. Present Experience

1. Date of joining this educational facility: ______________________

2. Why did you decide to join this facility: ______________________

3. Responsibilities of position (to include additional tasks, e.g., supervision and training of paraprofessionals, subject area teaching, etc.): ______________________

4. Please describe the criteria for and processes used in selection of facility's staff, professional and nonprofessional: ______________________

5. Evaluation of students attending this facility:

   a. In general, does the condition of pregnancy appear to influence in any way their learning, attentiveness, etc.? If yes, how? ______________________

   b. Do you find the girls easier, or harder, or about the same to teach when compared with students of similar age you have taught in regular school programs? ______________________

   c. In general, how would you evaluate the girls' motivation toward learning? ______________________

d. Do you think the girls want to attend this program; are generally motivated to do so?

____

____

e. Other comments? ____

____

____

6. Value of program to the students:

a. Do you think the girls perceive the program of the facility as really helping them?

____

____

b. Do you think the girls served, on the whole, will be returning to school, and remaining there as a result of exposure to this program? If yes, why? If no, why not?

____

____

c. What percent, approximately, do you think will return to school?

____

d. Other comments? ____

____

____

7. Evaluation of course of instruction:

a. Is the course of instruction offered by facility in need of change?

____ In need of change

____ Generally appropriate

____ Other (specify at item c below)

b. If in need of change, specify the modifications you would suggest?

____

____

c. Other comments? ______________________________

____

8. Describe, in your opinion, the factors facilitating establishment/development of facility:

____

____

____

9. Specify the types of contacts with departments, agencies, institutions, etc., whose services were/or are used:

____

____

____

10. What problems were encountered in the establishment or development of the program:

____

____

____

____

11. What recommendations would you suggest for improving the functioning of the facility, if any:

____

____

____

____

____

B6

Center for Urban Education

Educational Facilities for Pregnant School Age Girls

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHING PERSONNEL

A. Background Information

1. Sex (please check)

____ Male ____ Female

2. Age as of last birthday (please check)

____ 20 - 25 ____ 46 - 50

____ 26 - 30 ____ 51 or more

____ 31 - 35

____ 36 - 40

____ 41 - 45

3. Educational background (indicate type of degree & specify major field)

____ College degree: specify major field ______________________________

____ College degree plus some graduate work: specify extent of graduate work and field of concentration

____

____

____ Master's degree: specify field ______________________________

____ Doctorate: specify field ______________________________

____ Other educational training: specify ______________________________

____

4. Licensed by N.Y.C. Board of Education to teach following subjects:

______________________ ______________________

______________________ ______________________

______________________ ______________________

____ Regular or ____ Substitute license(s) (please check)

B. Prior Teaching Experience

1. Total number of years of teaching experience (please check)

____ Less than one year

____ One to two years

____ Three to five years

____ Six to ten years

____ Eleven to fifteen years

____ Sixteen years or more

2. Where teaching has been done (please check)

____ In New York City only

____ In New York City and suburbs

____ Other geographic areas (specify) ____________________

____

3. Subject areas taught prior to joining educational facility:

____________________ ____________________

____________________ ____________________

4. Grades taught prior to joining educational facility:

____________________ ____________________

____________________ ____________________

5. Any prior experience with special school programs: (e.g., home instruction, "600" schools, retarded children, school dropouts, etc.) specify type and length of experience:

____________________ ____________________

____________________ ____________________

____________________ ____________________

____________________ ____________________

C. Present Experience

1. Date of joining this educational facility: ______________________

2. Why did you decide to join this facility: ______________________

_________________________________ _________________________________

_________________________________ _________________________________

3. Please list current teaching assignments:

Subject area(s) or classes taught	Number in class	Grade of class (if class is essentially ungraded, give range of grades encompassed)
________________	_______	______________________________
________________	_______	______________________________
________________	_______	______________________________
________________	_______	______________________________

4. Do you have any additional teaching assignments, e.g., individual tutoring, supervision of educational assistants, testing of students, etc? specify:

_________________________________ _________________________________

_________________________________ _________________________________

_________________________________ _________________________________

5. Evaluation of students attending this facility:

   a. In general, does the condition of pregnancy appear to influence in any way their learning, attentiveness, etc.? If yes, how?

   _________________________________ _________________________________

   _________________________________ _________________________________

   b. Do you find the girls easier, or harder, or about the same to teach when compared with students of similar age you have taught in regular school programs?

   _________________________________ _________________________________

   _________________________________ _________________________________

   c. In general, how would you evaluate the girls' motivation toward learning?

   _________________________________ _________________________________

   _________________________________ _________________________________

   _________________________________ _________________________________

d. Do you think the girls want to attend this program; are really motivated to do so?

____

____

____

e. Other comments? ______________________________

____

____

6. Value of program to the students:

a. Do you think the girls perceive the program of the facility as really helping them?

____

____

____

b. Do you think the girls served, on the whole, will be returning to school, and remaining there as a result of exposure to this program? If yes, why? If no, why not?

____

____

____

c. What percent, approximately, do you think will return to school?

____

d. Other comments? ______________________________

____

____

____

7. Evaluation of course of instruction:

   a. Is the course of instruction offered by facility in need of change? (please check)

      ____ In need of change

      ____ Generally appropriate

      ____ Other (specify at item c below)

   b. If in need of change, specify the modifications you would suggest?

      ______________________________ ______________________________

      ______________________________ ______________________________

      ______________________________ ______________________________

   c. Other comments? ____________________ ____________________

      ______________________________ ______________________________

      ______________________________ ______________________________

      ______________________________ ______________________________

8. What problems have been encountered, if any:

   ______________________________ ______________________________

   ______________________________ ______________________________

   ______________________________ ______________________________

   ______________________________ ______________________________

9. What recommendations would you suggest for improving the functioning of the facility, if any:

   ______________________________ ______________________________

   ______________________________ ______________________________

   ______________________________ ______________________________

   ______________________________ ______________________________

   ______________________________ ______________________________

Facility in District No: ________

Center for Urban Education

Educational Facilities for Pregnant School Age Girls

RECORD FORM A

Center in District No.: ____________

1. Name of student: _________ _________ _________ _________ _________

2. Birth date: _________ __________

3. No. of years of prior school attendance: _________

a. In N.Y.C.: _________, **b. Out of city:** _________

c. If out of city, specify place(s): _________ _________ __________

_________ _________ _________ _________ _________ __________

4. Date of referral for admission to Facility: _________ _________

5. Referred for admission by whom: (specify, e.g., school guidance counselor, hospital maternity clinic, social agency, friend, etc.)

_________ _________ _________ _________ _________ _________ _________

6. Date of admission to Educational Facility: _________ _________ _________

7. No. of months pregnant at admission to Facility: _________ _________ ___

8. Contact with student's parents: (check relevant items)

Mother _____, **father** _____; **seen** _____, **not seen** _____;

By school personnel (give titles) _________ _________ _________ _____

_________ _________ _________ _________ _________ _________ _____

_________ _________ _________ _________ _________ _________ _____

On admission _____, **re: school progress** _____, **on discharge** _____.

Also seen by social service/health staff (give titles) _________ _____

_________ _________ _________ _________ _________ _________ _____

_________ _________ _________ _________ _________ _________ _____

On admission _____, **re: school planning** _____, **re: discharge planning** _____.

Other comments on parent contact: _________ _________ _________ _____

_________ _________ _________ _________ _________ _________ _____

_________ _________ _________ _________ _________ _________ _____

_________ _________ _________ _________ _________ _________ _____

_________ _________ _________ _________ _________ _________ _____

9. **Previous School Experience and Achievement:**

a. No. of schools attended previously: ________ ________ ________

b. Grade level at admission to Center: ________ ________ ________

c. Reading level at admission: ____________. If not tested,
give reading level ____________ and date ________ ________
at last test, if recorded.

d. Was attendance for the school year prior to pregnancy
regular ________ or irregular ________?

e. Was general school achievement for the year prior to pregnancy
Below passing ________, passing ________,
above passing ________, or good to excellent ________?

10. **Experience in Educational Facility:**

a. School achievement at Facility:
(list ALL courses taken and grades achieved.)

Course	Grade	Course	Grade

b. Give total no. of days of non-excused absence: ________ ________

If total includes absence for delivery and post-partum, indicate
no. of days for this: ________ ________ ________ ________

c. Reading level at discharge ____________, or to date ____________.

d. Grade level at discharge ____________, or to date ____________.

11. If student is still attending Facility (as of June, 1969), give basis:

a. Still pregnant ________

b. Post-partum, but not yet ready to return to regular school ________

c. Will return to regular school in Sept., 1969 ________

1) Previous school ________

2) Different school ____, specify ________ ________ ________

d. Other basis (specify) ________ ________ ________ ________ ____

________ ________ ________ ________ ________ ________ ____

12. If student is no longer attending Facility, give basis:

a. Returned to regular school ________

1) Previous school ________

2) Different school ____, specify ________ ________ ________

b. Graduated high school ________: will go to work ________,

will go to college ________, not known ________.

c. Not returning to school ________: has employment ________,

in Job Training/Manpower Program ________,

due to home and infant care responsibilities ________.

d. Has dropped out, i.e., is registered but has not attended

since admission: ________ ________ ________ ________

e. Other basis (specify) ________ ________ ________ ________

________ ________ ________ ________ ________ ________

f. Date of discharge from Facility: ________ ________ ________

Form completed by:

________ ________ ________ ____

Date completed:

________ ________ ________ ____

B14

Center for Urban Education

Educational Facilities for Pregnant School Age Girls
Board of Education - The City of New York - Office of School District___

RECORD FORM B

From:

____
District Superintendent

Date: ______________________

Re: ______________________

Born: ______________________

Address: ______________________

____

Dear ______________________

______________________, a student in your school, participated in a Federally-funded Project sponsored by the New York City Board of Education. We are now evaluating the project and would appreciate your appraisal of this student's scholastic achievement and personal adjustment.

Please fill in the form below and return it in the enclosed envelope, att: ______________________.

Very truly yours,

____
District Superintendent

A. Scholastic Achievement

1. Has the student maintained grade level?______________

2. What are areas of strengths? ______________________

____

3. What are areas of weakness? ______________________

____

4. Is the student taking courses leading to a diploma? __________

4.1 Is the student ___ likely ___ unlikely to graduate from your school? (please check)

4.2 When is expected graduation date? ______________________

4.3 Receiving remedial help? ______________________

4.4 In what area(s)? ________________

5. Latest standardized test scores
Name of test ________________ date __________ score ______
________________ ______
________________ ______

B. Personal Adjustment

1. Are you aware of special problems that are influencing this student's performance?
____
____

2. Are the student's "peer relationships" satisfactory? __________
____

3. How is student's personal-social behavior rated by teachers?
____
____

4. Is student receiving special guidance help? __________
____

5. Please give actual attendance record for this term: __________
____

C. Additional Information
(please include honors, special service to school, and extra-curricular activities)
____
____
____
____

Center for Urban Education

Educational Facilities for Pregnant School Age Girls

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR GROUP INTERVIEWS WITH GIRLS ATTENDING EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES

I. Prior School Experience

USE FOR RESPONDENTS' REPLIES, ETC.

a) First of all, let's talk about how you felt about going to regular school:

1. Did you like, or not like, going to school?

2. Did you think school was helping you, or not helping you?

(For either response, explore basis.)

b) When you first found out you were pregnant, what did you think would happen about school?

Further probes:

1. What did you think your schools would do?

2. What did you think you could do?

c) What if your schools had told you that you could still attend them, by going to your regular classes, except probably for gym, and be excused for visits to the clinic during the pregnancy, that you didn't have to leave, would you have stayed in your regular schools?

1. OR Would you have wanted to come to a special school like this one?

2. Those of you who would have wanted to stay in regular school, can you tell me why?

3. For the others, why would you have wanted to come to this special school?

4. If no one would have wanted to stay in regular school, can you tell me why?

d) What would you have done if you couldn't stay in your regular schools, and there was no school like this one for you to come to?

II. Experience with Educational Facility

a) When you first heard there was a school for pregnant girls, what did you think of it?

Further probes:

1. Did you think you had to come here, that is, that you had to attend like in regular school?
2. Or, did you think it was up to you whether or not you came here?
3. Do you know other girls of your ages who are also pregnant, but who are not coming to this kind of school?
4. If YES, why aren't they coming?
5. Note: If the response is that there is no room for them, inquire further: Do you know any girls who might still not come even if there were room, and if YES, why?

b) Now that you have been coming here, how do you find this school?

Further probes:

1. Is it the same, or different from the schools you've gone to before?
2. How is it the same?
3. How is it different?
4. How does it feel going to school while you are pregnant?
5. How do you feel about the school's being known as a place for pregnant girls?
6. What about the size of the classes?
7. What about having students from different grades in the same classes?
8. Are you learning more, or less than in the regular schools you went to before?
9. How do you feel about the teachers?
10. What about having social workers to talk to? Is this helpful or not?

c) Some of the girls seem to be absent a lot - do you have any ideas as to why this happens?

d) Has coming to this school had any effect on your plans for the future? If YES, how?

Further probes:

1. Well, you are going to have a baby, or have had one, what happens about school then?

III. Evaluation of Educational Facility

a) What do you think is good about this school?

b) What do you think is not-so-good about this school?

c) How do you think this school and its program could be improved?

d) What do you think is the most important thing we should tell the Board of Education about girls who get pregnant while they are in school?

Center for Urban Education

Educational Facilities for Pregnant School Age Girls

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS FOLLOWING GROUP INTERVIEW

1. Please tell us how old you are: ______________

2. What is your grade in school: ______________

3. a) What was the date (please give month and year)

when you stopped going to regular school: __________ _______

b) What was the date (please give month and year)

when you started coming to this special school: __________ _______

4. If you were told you could stay in a regular school while you were pregnant, would you want:

To stay in regular school _____

OR

To come to the kind of school you are now in _____

(Please Check ONE)

5. Before you came to this special school, did you think girls who were pregnant would:

Not be allowed to come back to school after the pregnancy _____

OR

Just be suspended from school until after the pregnancy _____

(Please Check ONE)

6. Who sent you to register in this special school?

A school nurse _____

A school teacher _____

A school guidance counselor _____

An attendance officer _____

A hospital social worker _____

A hospital doctor or nurse _____

A welfare investigator _____

Another girl _____

Someone else _____; who? ______________________________

(Please Check ONE)

7. a) What courses that you are now taking help you the most? ______________________________

____

b) What courses that you are now taking do you feel don't help you? ______________________________

____

c) What courses would you want to take which this school can't give you? ______________________________

____

8. If it were just up to you, what would you most want to do, once you have your baby:

Stay home and take care of the baby _____

Try to get a job _____

Go back to regular school _____

Something else _____; please tell us what ______________________________

(Please Check ONE)

____

____

9. Anything else you would like to tell us? ______________________________

____

____

____

APPENDIX C

STAFF LIST

Yetta H. Appel, Evaluation Director

Ruth R. Berken, Educational Consultant

Deborah Shapiro, Research Consultant
Study Director
Child Welfare Research Program
Columbia University School of Social Work

Sandra Mills, Research Assistant
Graduate Student
Columbia University School of Social Work

David Garcia, Statistical Clerk
Graduate Student
Columbia University School of Social Work